

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME II NO. 2

(VOLUME LXVI OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

June 1952

TWO COMIC FRAGMENTS

MR. C. H. ROBERTS has published a fragment of a Greek Comedy in the *Antinoopolis Papyri* No. 15 and suggested that a papyrus published by Schubart (*Ber. d. Sächs. Akad.* xcv. 5, No. 23) may be a fragment of the same codex. I think that the two taken together tell us something of the play.

I can add little in the way of readings. *Antinoopolis* 15 recto: l. 3 perhaps διὰ τήνδε γ' ἐπεβέβλητ' ἐκεῖ, l. 4 (with Fraenkel but without change of speaker) ἀρ' ἐστ' (the speaker refuses to believe his wife owns the box, which he has seen the woman (2) deposit), l. 5 νῶν?, l. 7 ἄγμιον, ll. 10-11 the lamp for reading, as in *Clouds* 18; perhaps τί δέ; κέραμος, οὐκ εἶδες, ἐπιγεγραμμένος (for inscribed cup cf. *Euboulos* (188/69 K.)), ll. 18-19 perhaps ἀφανὲς κοῦχ ἡμέτερον τὴν ἐμποδῶν ταραχὴν ἱκανῶς θεῖμεν δέ πως ἐντός κτλ. with no change of speaker. I include these in the text here printed.

Antinoopolis Papyri No. 15

Recto

- A [ἐμ]ῆς γυνα[ικὸς] .[
[? τῆς μη]τρὸς [.....]εἰ δὲ τῇ γυ[νὴ]
ἔδωκε καὶ δι[ὰ τήνδε γ' ἐπε]βέβλητ' ἐκεῖ
ὁ δακτύλιος, [? ἀρ' ἐστ'] ἐκείνης;
- B οὐχ [ὁ]ρ[ᾷς];
- 5 ἀνοιξον εἰ τι καιρὸς ἄγει [νῶν] χρ[η]σίμ[ον]
ἐν' ἰδῶμεν.
- A αἶ· (B) τί ἐστι; (A) χλαμύδος [ἄγ]μιον
διεσπαραγμένης παλαίας, ὑπὸ [σ]έων
σχέδον τι καταβεβρωμ[έ]νης—
- B ἀ[λλ'] οὐδὲ ἔν.
- A καὶ περιδέραια καὶ περίσκελις—
- B []ατ[
- 10 ἐμοὶ προσένεγκε τὸν λύχνον· τ[ὶ δέ; κέ]ραμος,
οὐκ εἶδες, ἐπιγεγραμμέν[ος]; (A) νῆ τὸν Δία—
- B ὦν, ἀνοιγ' ἀνωθεν· (A) γρά[μματ']....[ταλο] ..[
ἐπιγράμματ' εἶδον.
- B τί [ποτε....] βούλεται
- A [.....] ἔνεστ' ἐν αὐτῷ παιδίῳ
15 [γ]νωρί[σμαθ'· ἢ] μήτηρ δ' ἐτήρει ταῦτα· θὲς
πάλιν ὡς ἐκεῖτο· σηματοῦμαι δ' αὐτ' ἐγώ.
[ο]ὐ νῦν ἐπιτηδείως ἔχει, μὰ τὸν Δία,
[ζ]ητεῖν ἀφαν[έ]ς κ[οῦχ] ἡμέτερον τὴν ἐμποδῶν
[τα]ραχὴν ἱκανῶς θεῖμ[εν] δ[έ] πως· ἐντός ποτε
- 20 [γέ]ρωμ' ἐμαντοῦ κ[.....] τοῦμπαλιν

F

Verso

		Λυσίππος
		Κανθαρος
		Γοργίας
		Φίλιπος
		Θεραπαινα
	Κανθαρος	
	λέ(γει)	
	Δεινότη[ερ]α τίς πέπονθε τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει	
	ἐμοῦ; μ[ὰ τ]ὴν Δῆ[μ]ητρα καὶ τὸν οὐράνον·	
	πέμπτ[ο]ν γεγάμηκα μῆνα πεισθεὶς τῷ πατρί·	
	ἀφ' ἧς [< γε > γά]μηκα νυκτός—ὦ δέσποινα νύξ,	
10	σε μάλ[ιστ]α ὁ[ρ]θὴν ἐπάγομ' οὐ λέγω λόγου—	
	μ[ὲ]ν οὐ γεγ[έν]ημαι νύκτ' ἀπόκοι[το]ς πώποτ[ε]	
	ἀπὸ τ[ῆς] γυναι[κ]ός ἀσ[σ]ον ἣν ἔχειν ἔδ[ει]	
	οὐποτ' [ἀπόκοι]τος γέγονα· .ρυκ.ρ. [
	μετὰ τοὺς γάμους [
15	δίκαιον ἦρων καὶ ὅτι σ[
	αὐτῆς ἐλευθέρω γὰρ ἦθαι καὶ βίω	
	δεθείς ἀπλάστῳ τὴν φιλοῦσαν ἡγάπ[αν].]	
	τί προσφέρεις μοι [δεικ]νύουσα καθ' ἐν [
	ἅπαντ [α. κ]αρδίαν ἀλγῶ γ' ὀρ[ών]	

As in the *Synaristosai* (Cist. 655) tokens are inspected in the absence of their owner (or carrier); two persons are present. The tokens are not recognized, though their container is sealed with the ring of the wife of one of them. The tokens are a piece of cloth, a bracelet, an anklet, an inscribed sherd. They are put back where they were. The inspector will not believe that they prove his wife the mother of the child and abandons further search because he has enough troubles already. This cannot be the last scene of a play since no room is left for clearing up either the 'present confusion' or the identity of the baby.

The verso cannot precede the recto because the columns (or pages) are numbered 60/61. Nor can the verso be the beginning of the play because the list of characters is neither in order of appearance nor alphabetical; it is too short for a play and too long for a scene; it must therefore be the characters who appear in the act, extracted in the same order in which they appear in the *dramatis personae* at the beginning. The only possibilities therefore are that we have scenes from the same play or selected independent scenes from different plays. The former seems more likely; the column number 60/61 suggests a late act in the second play of the codex; the Cairo Menander runs to about thirty pages a play, but here the act-headings are elaborated and the column may itself be shorter. The situation is clear. A young man Kantharos has been faithful to his wife for the four months since he obeyed his father and married her; and has learnt to love her. Yet he is now the most miserable man in Athens and some woman (presumably the servant, as she is the only feminine character in the list) is proving everything in detail. The speech reminds me of Pamphilus in the *Hecyra* (361), and even without the recto we should have to assume that Kantharos' wife had borne a child which would have to be a five months' child (cf. *Epilet.* 758) if it were his; in the end, of course, he will be found to have violated his wife four months before their marriage. The recto fits perfectly: as in the *Hecyra* the wife probably fled home to have her child; hence the trouble between the families, 'the present confusion'. The servant is sent to expose the child with the box of tokens; perhaps she sees the father-in-law coming and rushes with the child into Kantharos' house, abandoning the tokens like Halisca in the *Cistellaria*.

The Schubart fragment only gives the ends of lines on the recto and the beginnings on the verso: on the recto Kantharos is addressed and there is talk of a nurse (13, 15), a male (?) child (12), and a rape (14); on the verso *θεραπ.* in the margin is presumably the servant; at least two other persons are present at any rate at the end (31-32). The details are difficult. 1. 9 τοῦτο ξίφος: a sword can be used for attempted suicide (*Cist.*, *Misoumenos*), as part of a soldier's equipment (*Samia*), probably to cut off an unfaithful woman's hair (*Perikeiromene*), perhaps to murder an unfaithful woman (Menelaus and Helen), or as a recognition token (*Rudens* 1156 and presumably Menander's *Encheiridion*). The last is most likely here: perhaps the tragic word is used because this is a recognition scene (cf. *Perikeiromene* and Schroeder No. 3). Someone who has a recognition token which convicts Kantharos of the rape is interrogating him: perhaps the *Hecyra* again provides the model—the little sword may have been stolen from the girl by Kantharos and left (καταλιπών, 5 ..[καταλι]πεῖν, 10 ..κατέλιπον, 11) with someone else, like the ring which Bacchis held, but it is difficult to see who this someone else could be. The parallel may therefore rather be the *Epitrepontes* where the girl has the token; and then in this play also Kantharos had left it with the girl when he violated her. The verso is most obscure. I give it as in Schubart except that I have not noted the letters which he marks as above the line and I have added in brackets supplements which seem to me likely:

	θεραπ.	εμμενεδοίκεισιπ
20		αποτουγαρ[ι]οῦ.του
		ελκυσον:ινειδη
οὐκεξελεε..		οὐκ'ελεκε'οντω[ς]
		νεόπλουτος:ώπ[αι]
		αἴτηπόθενλακο
25		τονδεστίτουτο
		εἰτουπριαμέ[νου]
		κεκτημένο
		ανωρέουσι:κ
		οτουμονεὺ[ρῶν]
30		ταλλότριον.ώσ.
		φυλάττομενγ
		φυλαττετε:γν[ωρίζεται]
		ὁ τουφανέντ[ος παιδίου πατῆρ]
		ὑμῶν τις
35		ἐξωιτοποι
		τουθ'ηχ

I thought first of a scene of violence, but *ελκυσον* and *ελεκετε* are said to different people and the 'rust' cannot be explained. Perhaps the little sword is rusted into its scabbard and has to be dragged out and then shines brightly and can be read (23). Mr. Roberts suggests rather that οὐκ ἐξελεε in the margin may be a stage direction 'he failed to draw the sword' and then the sword is drawn and the name reveals its owner as νεόπλουτος. The woman who has it (24) does not own it; her interlocutor originally bought it and is amazed that she should have it (27) and with her permission he now keeps it because the person who gave it to her will be 'one of his friends' (33-34).

It seems to me likely that this verso precedes the recto and that the page belongs after the Antinoopolis page. The father-in-law and his associate, perhaps, of the token-inspection meet the servant who is probably herself the

nurse of the girl and interrogate her about the little sword which they have found in the recognition tokens (?). They manage to get the blade clear of its rust and it discloses the name of Kantharos' father(?). This fixes the father of the baby as Kantharos or his brother, and they then proceed to interrogate Kantharos (recto). These two scenes probably belong to a later stage in the same act as the Antinoopolis papyrus and it is likely that it is the fourth act of the play. As the order is verso/recto it must either be the next page, which is probably too close, or the next page but two, which gives sufficient space for the end of the Kantharos scene and possibly a scene in which the father-in-law and the other show that they now know that the baby belongs to Kantharos' wife. Mr. Roberts notes the possibility that Menander is the author and rejects it: I agree; the tone seems to me more like Apollodorus as we know him from the *Hecyra*.

I am very grateful to Mr. C. H. Roberts and Professor E. G. Turner for reading my manuscript and for their suggestions.

University College, London

T. B. L. WEBSTER

MUSES AND SIRENS

THE original Sirens, according to Buschor (*Die Musen des Jenseits*, Munich, 1944), were not those of Homer, which are only partially identifiable with Phorcys' daughters, the monsters of Greek sea saga, but rather infernal counterparts of the heavenly Muses, who charmed the souls of the dead in Hades with their song, and acted as their escort from this world to the next.¹

It is the main purpose of this paper to suggest that this view, attractive though it may appear, can scarcely be maintained on the evidence. Also the very natures of the Muses and Sirens were so opposed that it seems misleading to describe one, however loosely, in terms of the other.

It is true that both Muses and Sirens were primarily regarded as songstresses, but the differences between them seem to outweigh any superficial resemblances. The Muses' traditional home was Pieria, a land watered by the springs flowing from Olympus and neighbouring mountains. The Sirens, on the other hand, dwelt on an unspecified island which lay somewhere between Aeaea and Scylla's cave.

The Muses again were the divine inspirers of poesy, whereas the Sirens charmed only to destroy. The two are entirely dissociated in Homer, and possessed distinct genealogies. The Muses are stated by Hesiod (*Theog.* 53 ff., 915 ff.) to have been the daughters of Zeus by Mnemosyne, while the Sirens were born of Phorcys (Soph. fr. 777 N.) or Achelous (for references see Wentzel, *R.E.* i. 215, s.v. 'Achelous'), and Chthon (Eur. *Hel.* 168). It was not until Hellenistic times that they became rivals in an aetiological myth (Paus. ix. 34. 3; Steph. Byz. s.v. ἀντρεα), and a Muse was said to have been their mother (for references see Zwicker, *R.E.* iii. 294 ff., s.v. 'Sirenen'). Finally, the Muses were represented as anthropomorphic in art,² whereas the Sirens were depicted as woman-headed birds.

¹ The equation had already been suggested by Wilamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen*, i. 268-9, and Cumont, *Symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, 148.

² The earliest known representation of a

Muse occurs on a Middle Corinthian kotyle (600-575 B.C.) from Ithaca (*B.S.A.* xliii. 18, No. 39). Calliope is depicted on the François Vase.

The stages whereby the local divinities of Pieria were transformed into vehicles of inspiration are matter for surmise. Farnell (*Cults*, v. 434 ff.), probably rightly, rejected the view that they were nature spirits in origin like the Nymphs, on the ground that their subsequent history, despite casual associations with Dionysus (Plut. *Symp.* 8 praef.) and Thrace (*Il.* ii. 595; Eur. *Rhes.* 921 ff.), shows no trace of nature worship.

It is true, of course, that their cult was established in a mountain fastness, and close to prophetic springs, but their name suggests that they had always belonged to the psychic domain, and that their traditional background may have been of less account (see Gruppe, *Mythol.* 1076 ff.).

Although Pieria is not mentioned in relation to the Muses in Homer, it seems probable from the frequent references to their dwelling on Olympus that the poet connected them with that region. Their close association with Apollo suggests that their original home may have been even farther north,¹ a speculation not entirely unsupported by the statement that Zeus was their father.

The relationship of the Pierides to the Muses of Helicon is uncertain, but if, as seems probable, the Muse cult moved south with Apollo, then, as A. R. Burn has suggested in a recent article (*B.S.A.* xliv. 323), the massif which was most accessible from the lowlands of Boeotia would have been most likely to recommend itself to the northern invaders as a centre of worship for their mountain goddesses. Certainly they were well established on Helicon in Hesiod's time, whose works did so much to augment their fame.

The Sirens had no legendary associations with Apollo, although kelestones crowned his temple at Delphi (Paus. x. 5. 12) and a bird-monster appears as his familiar in a vase-painting (from Olympia: *C.V.A.* London B.M. No. 3, pl. 38, 1a). They are frequent visitors, on the other hand, to the Dionysiac revels (see, for example, B.M. E. 14; Beazley, *A.R.V.* 99, Nikosthenes painter No. 16²), and clearly reflect something of their abandon.

This difference in mood is further emphasized by the association of the Muses with Orpheus (for references see Guthrie, *op. cit.*, n. 1 to ch. iii), and by the legend of the Sirens' defeat at the latter's hand (Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* iv. 909 ff.; *Orphic Argon.* 1288 ff.). Orpheus is not mentioned by Homer, although Circe refers to the Argo in connexion with Scylla (*Od.* xii. 69 ff.). The story of his victory over the Sirens may be older, as he is included among the Argonauts in a Delphic relief (P. de la Coste-Messelière, *Au Musée de Delphes*, pl. xi. 180) and by Pindar (*Pyth.* 4. 177).

Weicker (*Der Seelenvogel*) held that all researches into the nature of the Sirens, up to his time, had erred in commencing with Homer's monsters, and even Buschor's analysis attempts to deprive the latter, in some measure, of their essential priority. Nevertheless, any unbiased investigation must commence with the oldest evidence available, even though it may appear at first to offer less scope for inquiry than the manifold *Mischwesen* of orientalised art.

The information which Homer gives concerning the Sirens may be summarized as follows (*Od.* xii. 39 ff.). They bewitch men with their song. The fate awaiting anyone so bewitched is death. They dwell in a flowery meadow, on an

¹ The traditional view that Apollo possessed a northern origin is unproved, but has at least as much to recommend it as the theory that he reached Greece from Anatolia.

See Rose, *Hist. of Greek Myth.* 135 ff.; Guthrie, *Orpheus* 44 and note 20 to ch. iii.

² For other examples see Zwicker, *loc. cit.*

island set in a stormless sea. They are two in number, and lay claim to something very like omniscience.

The description of the island provides Buschor with his main evidence that the Sirens originally dwelt in Paradise. But although meadows are sometimes associated with the dead (see, for example, Plato, *Rep.* 614 c), sea-meadows are well-known phenomena, and are a feature to this day of Gli Galli,¹ the *Σειρηνοῦσσαι* (Strabo 22, 23, 247, 251, 252, 258; [Arist.] *Misc. Ausc.* 103) of western Greek tradition. The presence of the victims' bones and mouldering flesh merely adds a touch of realism like the scattering of the sailors' brains in Polyphemus' cave (*Od.* ix. 290), and has no Underworld associations. The remaining features are well-known folk-lore elements, and hardly to be taken seriously.

It is true, as Buschor insists (*op. cit.* 9), that the Sirens do not devour their victims like other monsters, Scylla for example, but it is hard to detect evidence of original benevolence in such forbearance.

Much has been made of Alcman's (*fr.* 7 B Bergk) charming compliment to a maiden's song. Both Wilamowitz (*op. cit.* 268) and Buschor (*op. cit.* 5) regard it as evidence that 'Muse' and 'Siren' were virtually synonymous terms, as though the latter reference were not an afterthought whose very point depends upon its startling contrast to the sober Muse. Although *σειρήν* is employed in a playful sense here, and bears no sinister significance in some other passages (see, for example, Pind. *fr.* 84 (Schroeder), 10-11), there is no evidence to show that it originally possessed an innocent connotation.

Their dual number separates the Sirens sharply from the Muses, who were primarily regarded as members of a chorus.² In post-Homeric times their complement remained constant at three (for references see n. 4 below) until Plato increased it in order to provide a guardian for each of his eight mythical spheres. The latter instance troubled Plutarch (*Symp.* ii. 745 c), who supposed that Plato was loosely confusing Sirens and Muses in this passage. But there were nine Muses according to the latest³ epic tradition, and there was no precedent for transporting them from Olympus. It is merely fanciful to argue with Buschor (*op. cit.* 11) that Plato preferred the former in order to emphasize their historical priority, for that is what his argument amounts to. Probably such vagaries are often the result of individual caprice, like the conventional names bestowed from time to time upon both Muses (for references see Mayer, *R.E.* 694, s.v. 'Musai') and Sirens.⁴

The question of the precise relationship of Homer's Sirens to the bird-women of the orientalizing period of Greek art is complicated by the existence of bearded bird-men, which actually predominate among the earlier examples. Many of these are clearly decorative (see, for example, Buschor, *op. cit.*, fig. 23, pp. 33 and 43 ff.), but others seem to represent amorphous powers⁵ of various kinds, including some of those (e.g. the *κῆρες*) mentioned by Homer. The Sirens

¹ A good modern account of these islands is given by Norman Douglas, *Siremland*, 42-43.

² The frequent appeals to single Muses do not preclude the existence of others. See Stanford on *Od.* xxiv. 62.

³ *Od.* xxiv. 63, where, however, Stanford has suggested that the absence of the article may indicate an indefinite number.

⁴ e.g. *IMEPOTIA* on an Attic red-fig.

stamnos (B.M. E. 440: *Mon. dell' Inst.* i, pl. 8; *C.V.A. Lond.*, pl. 20. 1) and the Hellenistic names Thelxiope or Thelxinoe, Molpe, Aglaophonos, and Peisinoe. But Parthenope, Leukosia, and Ligeia appear to be of geographical origin. Cf. Weicker, *op. cit.* 65 and n. 2.

⁵ See E. Kunze, *A.M.* lvii. 135 ff.

were evidently included among the latter, and as such assumed a similar physical and pictorial form. Their special association with music was emphasized in some examples by furnishing them with harps,¹ or by their inclusion in revel contexts (see, for example, Louvre E. 695; *B.C.H.*, 1893, p. 238, fig. 6).

Scenes from the *Odyssey* are rare in seventh-century art, and the earliest representation of the Siren story appears on a black-figured Corinthian aryballos which dates from the second quarter of the sixth century B.C. (Boston 01.8100: Bulle, *Strena Helbigiana*, 31, fig. 17). Although the design includes some strange features (see Pollard, *A.J.A.* liii. 347 ff.), the main details are sufficiently clear.

Later designs include the legend of the Sirens' suicide (for references see p. 62, n. 4), which is not mentioned in literature until Lycophron (712 ff., 1463 ff.).

If this sequel was part of the original version, as seems likely, then it marked the end² of the monsters for all time, and it is difficult to see how they could be confused with members of a *göttlicher Musenchor*.

The true nature of the *κηληδόνες* or *εὐγγες* which graced Apollo's temple at Delphi and Sophocles' tomb (*Vit. Soph.* ix) has never been determined, but there is reason to suppose that they were Sirens (Paus. x. 5. 12). If this were so, a preference for such sobriquets suggests that attempts were made to humanize them even before Euripides (*Helen* 167 ff., fr. 911 N.).

The origin of the custom of depicting Sirens upon tombs is unknown, but as such well-known examples as the pillar-perching Siren from Xanthos (Smith, *B.M. Cat. of Sculpture*, i. 93, pl. 12), and the monsters of the so-called 'Harpy Tomb' (ibid.) derive from the east, it seems probable that mainland examples drew their inspiration from that quarter. So that even if Buschor is right in suggesting that Orphism played its part in their creation (op. cit. 38), he is still far from proving the priority of such creatures to Homer's Sirens.

The chthonian associations of the Sirens were well established by the end of the fifth century B.C. Euripides' *Helen* appeals both to the Sirens, daughters of Chthon, and to Persephone to join in a dirge (though the relationship between them, if any, is not made explicit), while Plato (*Cratylus* 403 d) tells how even their powers failed to persuade Pluto to release them from the Underworld. But it is hard to believe that such references were not suggested by the practice of placing Sirens upon tombs rather than by any independent tradition.

The Siren cult at Naples undoubtedly possessed chthonian features, but the evidence for its existence cannot be traced before Strabo (246). Probably it represented a conflation by Greek colonists of the Siren legend with a local cult. The story, preserved by Hyginus (ed. Rose, 103), that the Sirens wept over the loss of Persephone and followed her into the Underworld is clearly aetiological and designed to explain the existence of the mourning Sirens into which the tomb Sirens finally degenerated.

Such then, in outline, is the nature of the evidence upon which Buschor has based his thesis. Of the general quality and fascination of his work there can be no doubt, for its style proclaims the masterpiece. As a piece of critical scholarship it is open to the gravest suspicion.

University College of North Wales, Bangor

J. R. T. POLLARD

¹ The earliest known examples are roughly contemporary with the composition of the *Odyssey*. See Kunze, op. cit. 135, pl. v. 5.

² For the Sirens as mortal ghosts, see Weicker, op. cit. 45.

METAPHORS OF DEATH IN THE *PHAEDO*

IN Plato's usage the most frequent verbal equivalent for 'to die' is 'to depart'. By this substitution he expresses his fundamental belief and at the same time adopts a natural and universal euphemism. The soul's departure to Hades is the common conception in Greek usage from Homer onwards; ἀπέναι, οἶχθαι, etc. are so used, often with a more explicit term added (e.g. Soph. *O.T.* 959 θανάσιμον βεβηκότα), but at times without (Pind. *Pyth.* i. 93 ἀποχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαταν μανύει). In places such words, used of death, seem to convey a popular and colloquial use. Thus in Eur. *Alc.* 393 ff. the child speaks in simple terms which throughout the speech suggest realism—μαῖα δὴ κάτω βέβακεν . . . οἰχομένης δὲ σοῦ, μάτερ, κτλ. Again in Ar. *Frogs* 83 ff. ἀπολιπὼν μ' ἀποίχεται is answered by ποῖ γῆς ὁ τλήμων; ποῖ γῆς is comic absurdity, but ὁ τλήμων makes clear the understood reference to death, borne out by ἐς Μακάρων εὐωχίαν.

In the *Phaedo* it is to be noted that ἀπέναι, οἶχθαι, ἀποδηῆσαι are the chief equivalents used for death both in the opening and in the closing chapters, where the tone is informal and the level of style is that of ordinary conversation. Here, too, the words chosen combine commonplace usage with the unquestioning assumption of Socrates about his future. As the argument proceeds, fresh metaphors in addition become appropriate to its several stages. The central section, containing the final proof, is especially noteworthy for the metaphors of conflict which are there introduced.

Early in the dialogue there are two instances (58 c, e) of the common prose word τελευτᾶν. Plato uses this on occasion, but obviously its implication is not congenial to his thought about death. At 117 d Socrates' words ἀκήκοα, ὅτι ἐν εὐφημῷ χρῆ τελευτᾶν may perhaps point to a proverbial or familiar saying.

Phaedo uses at the outset (58 e) the explicit formula εἰς Αἴδου ἵοντα. Socrates himself is presently quoted as speaking (61 b ff.) of ἀπέναι and οἶχθαι, again (67 b) as saying οἱ ἐγὼ πορεύομαι. Mention recurs of departure to Hades, or to the presence of other gods (e.g. 80 d, 63 b). At 61 e μέλλοντα ἐκέισε ἀποδημεῖν, followed by ἀποδημίας τῆς ἐκεῖ, implies a change of abode, a sojourn at least; cf. 114 c, εἰς οἰκῆσεις ἔτι καλλίους κτλ. The suggestion of going home, movingly conveyed in *Crito* 44 b by the adapted line of Homer, ἡματι κεν τριτάτῃ Φθίην ἐρίβωλον ἴκοιο, is nowhere given so clearly in the *Phaedo*; but it is inherent in all the talk of the soul's affinity with the Forms; cf. (for example) 84 b εἰς τὸ ζυγγενὲς καὶ εἰς τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀφικομένη ἀπηλλάχθαι κτλ.

From the point of view of the survivors the pathetic use of ἀπολείπειν is found at 63 a ἡμᾶς ἀπολείπων, and 78 a σὺ . . . ἡμᾶς ἀπολείπεις (cf. Ar. *Frogs* 83, cited above).

The implication that death is a release and escape to a better place is found in the discussion about suicide: 62 b οὐ δεῖ ἑαυτὸν λύειν οὐδ' ἀποδιδράσκειν, 63 a φεύγειν, 63 d, e οὐ φευκτέον. This note of release, with the further idea of purification, becomes clearer as the argument proceeds, according with the definition of death (67 d) as λύσις καὶ χωρισμός σώματος ἀπὸ ψυχῆς. 67 a ἕως ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἀπολύσῃ ἡμᾶς: cf. 81 d αἱ μὴ καθαρῶς ἀπολυθεῖσαι. (At *Timaeus* 85 e the use of the same verb suggests a new simile—(χολή) ἔλυσε τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτόθεν ὅλον νεὼς πείσματα μεθῆκέ τε ἐλευθέραν.) The verb ἀπαλλάττομαι (and its noun, e.g. 64 c) is now found repeatedly used of the soul's severance from the body (e.g. 80 d ff.), carrying not only its proper sense of dissociation but the added

half-colloquial implication of 'riddance'—67 a, ἀπαλλαττόμενοι τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀφροσύνης. The further definitely colloquial sense of 'making an end' (*Gorg.* 491 c εἰπὼν ἀπαλλάγηθι: *Ap.* 39 d ταῦτα μαντευσάμενος ἀπαλλάττομαι) may not be far away.

A metaphor derived straight from Homer appears at 70 a οἷχεται διαπτομένη (*Il.* xvi. 39 ἀπὸ δ' ἔπατο θυμός: *Od.* xi. 422, etc.). It is strikingly used also in *Rep.* 469 d ἀποπταμένου τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, λελοιπότης δὲ ᾧ ἐπολέμει. At 77 b the figure of dispersal is found—διασκεδάννυται, cf. 78 b. Earlier-expressed fears are gathered up at 84 b, with similar half-literal terms of dissolution—οὐδὲν δεινὸν μὴ φοβηθῇ . . . ὅπως μὴ διασπασθεῖσα ἐν τῇ ἀπαλλαγῇ τοῦ σώματος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνέμων διαφυσθθεῖσα καὶ διαπτομένη οἷχεται κτλ.

The affinity of death with sleep also goes back to Homer (*Il.* xiv. 231; Leaf: 'a familiar allegory everywhere'; *Il.* xvi. 672, 682), but is not commonly stressed either there or in the classical writers; the conception of the journey to Hades is preferred. Death as a sleep becomes a fairly frequent motif in epitaphs. In the *Phaedo* the analogy is implied, at least, in the argument from ἀνταπόδοσις, where (71 c-d) the alternation between sleep and waking is used as prototype of that between death and life. I find only two other references by Plato to this conception. At *Ap.* 40 d ff. death as a sleep is suggested as the possible alternative, in fact, to death as a change of abode—οἶον ὕπνος . . . οἶον ἀποδημήσαι. At *Rep.* 534 c we have a clearly ironic reference to the idea—καὶ τὸν νῦν βίον ὄνειρο-πολοῦντα καὶ ὑπνώττοντα, πρὶν ἐνθάδ' ἐξεγρέσθαι εἰς Αἶδον πρότερον ἀφικόμενον τελέως ἐπικαταδαρθάνειν. This forecasts the fate of the 'drowsy dreamer' who shrinks from the effort of dialectic; he goes indeed to Hades—to fall asleep once and for all. This seems to be the sole instance in which Plato explicitly uses the metaphor; it is quite alien to his serious thought, but fits well here as a humorous climax to his argument.

The pause at *Phaedo* 84 c (σιγῇ οὖν ἐγένετο κτλ.) marks the opening of the central and crucial section of the argument. From now onward, until the conclusion of the final proof, the atmosphere is one of strain. There are reminders of the approaching end—84 d διὰ τὴν παρούσαν συμφορὰν: 85 b ἕως ἂν Ἀθηναίων ἐὼσιν ἄνδρες ἑνδεκα—and the mood of conflict is introduced by the words of Simmias (85 c) μὴ οὐχὶ . . . ἐλέγχειν . . . πάνυ μαλθακοῦ εἶναι ἀνδρός. A twofold peril becomes obvious—the peril of the λόγος challenged by truth (cf. 86 e-87 a φαίνεται . . . ταυτὸν ἔγκλημα ἔχειν) and that of the soul under threat of death. In the interlude following Cebes' speech (88 c ff.) it is observable that in description of the argument metaphors of strife are used—88 c ἡμᾶς . . . ἐδόκουν ἀναταράξαι καὶ εἰς ἀπιστίαν καταβαλεῖν: 88 d νῦν εἰς ἀπιστίαν καταπέπτωκεν: 88 e ἐβόηθει τῷ λόγῳ: 89 a ὥσπερ πεφευγότας καὶ ἡττημένους ἀνεκαλέσατο καὶ προὔτρεψεν κτλ. The same suggestion of peril is conveyed ironically in Socrates' words to *Phaedo* (89 b) εἰάνπερ . . . ὁ λόγος τελευτήσῃ καὶ μὴ δυνάμεθα αὐτὸν ἀναβιώσασθαι. The theme of battle is renewed (89 c) in πρὶν ἂν νικήσω ἀναμαχόμενος κτλ. and the ensuing by-play about Heracles and Iolaus. It appears again at 95 b—ἔδοξεν εὐθύς τὴν πρώτην ἐφοδὸν οὐ δέξασθαι τοῦ σοῦ λόγου . . . Ὀμηρικῶς ἔγγυς ἰόντες πειρώμεθα κτλ.

This tone of conflict is suspended during Socrates' long exposition about causes (though the tension of the situation is recalled at 98 c δέδοκται . . . ὑπέχειν τὴν δίκην, cf. 99 a). It is resumed, in the course of the passage on the Forms, with the 'military' metaphors (so named, and fully annotated, by Burnet) which are used to supplement προσγίγνεσθαι, μετέχειν, etc. in

reference to the relation of Forms to particulars and to each other. It is in this general setting of conflict that these military terms find their place and their justification.

At 102 d *ὑπέχειν* may recall Socrates' earlier use of the word (98 e). Further expressions follow—102 d *φεύγειν καὶ ὑπεκχωρεῖν, ὅταν αὐτῷ προσήγῃ τὸ ἐναντίον . . . ὑπομένον δὲ . . . οὐκ ἐθέλει κτλ.*: 102 e *οὐ τετόλμηκεν*. The same words are repeated at 103 d. 104 b *ἐπιόνσης*, 104 c *οὐχ ὑπομένει ἐπιόντα*. A more specific term is used at 104 d—*ὅτι ἂν κατασχῇ . . . ἀναγκάζει κτλ.* At 104 e *ἐπιφέρει* appears, and is thereafter frequently used. Both these words are attached to *ψυχή* at 105 d.

The crucial instance of *θάνατος* is first introduced with a weak metaphor—105 e *ὁ δ' ἂν θάνατον μὴ δέχεται*. The 'military' terms continue at 106 a—*ὅποτε τις . . . ἐπαγαγοί, ὑπεξήει ἄν*: 106 b *ὅταν θάνατος ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἦ*. (It is in keeping with the tone of the passage that at 106 c *διαμάχεσθαι* is twice used of the process of argument.) The conclusion at 106 e carries similar language—*ἐπιόντος ἄρα θανάτου ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸ μὲν θνητὸν . . . αὐτοῦ ἀποθνήσκει, τὸ δ' ἀθάνατον ὧν καὶ ἀδιάφθορον οἵχεται ἀπὼν, ὑπεκχωρήσαν τῷ θανάτῳ*. It is noteworthy that here *κατασχέιν* is not used. Death is given no time to 'occupy'; on its first approach—*ἐπιόντος*—the immortal soul departs untouched, withdrawing before death.

The representation of *θάνατος* as the acting subject appears to be rare with Plato. At an earlier point in the *Phaedo* (67 d–e) the metaphor is very slight—*κάπειθ' ἦκοντος αὐτοῦ* (sc. *τοῦ τελνάναι*). *ἀγανακτεῖν*. The *Apology* gives by implication a stronger instance—39 a (*πονηρία*) *θᾶπτον γὰρ θανάτου θεῖ . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ βραδυτέρου ἑάλω*. The figure of Hades the Ravisher is frequent with the poets, and becomes a commonplace in epitaphs. For Socrates, on the contrary, Hades personified is a benign power—cf. 80 d *παρὰ τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ φρόνιμον θεόν*. Yet the reality of death is still 'the last enemy', and is in fact shortly to occupy the field. A conflict with death is not, indeed, in point—merely a withdrawal to a better and safer ground; but the military metaphors precisely fit the needs of the situation, while they make explicit the underlying tension of the whole passage. The climax of this section is not found in relationships between Forms and particulars, but in the safe escape of the soul of an individual man (cf. 106 e *ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον*) at the onset of the imminent event of death.

This proof accepted, we return to the natural metaphor of the soul's journey (107 d *τῆς ἐκείσε πορείας*) through the other world to a happy dwelling-place—114 c *εἰς οἰκίσσεις ἐπὶ τούτων καλλίους ἀφικνούνται*. The same figure of journeying marks the swift transition from myth to present fact—115 a *οὕτω περιμένει τὴν εἰς Αἴδου πόρειαν, ὡς πορευσόμενος ὅταν ἡ εἰμαρμένη καλῇ . . . ἐμὲ δὲ νῦν καλεῖ, κτλ.* The simple metaphors of the opening scene are now resumed—115 d *οἰχίσσομαι ἀπὼν*. Socrates' prayer repeats the theme of *ἀποδημία*—117 c *τὴν μετοίκησιν τὴν ἐνθένδε ἐκείσε εὐτυχῇ γενέσθαι*. At 118 a *καὶ αὐτὸς ἤπτετο* surely refers to Socrates, and he says . . . *τότε οἰχίσηται*. The final words about an offering to the God of Healing return to the theme of *ἀπαλλαγῇ*, confirming Socrates' whole attitude to death as implied in his early reference to the coming journey—61 b *ἐμὲ διώκειν ὡς τάχιστα*.

DOROTHY TARRANT

POSIDIPPUS AND DELPHI

WEINREICH pointed out in *Hermes*, liii (1918), pp. 437 f., that the name of Posidippus, the great Alexandrian epigrammatist, occurs in an inscription of Thermos¹ of c. 280 B.C., among the names of various persons on whom the Aetolians had at that time bestowed the *proxenia*. He rightly maintained that Posidippus received this honour for epigrams he must have composed on the Aetolian warriors and their victory against the Gauls in 280 B.C. Furthermore, it is of interest that in a mutilated psephisma of the Delphians of c. 276/275 B.C., now published in *Fouilles de Delphes*, iii. 3 (*Épigraphie*, 1943), No. 192, which grants *προξενίαν, προμαντείαν, προδικίαν, ἀσυλίαν, ἀ[τέλειαν]* πάντων καὶ τὰλλα ὅσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις προξένοις to at least seventeen persons from various parts of the Greek world, in ll. 9-10 we come across the names of a Posidippus and an Asclepiades.² As the Aetolians had the upper hand in the affairs of Delphi at that period,³ and considering that the name Posidippus is comparatively rare, and that it occurs in the inscription together with that of Asclepiades, the other great Alexandrian epigrammatist with whom he was so closely connected, it is not unreasonable to suggest that it is these two poets who were honoured at Delphi in c. 276/275 B.C. Honours of this nature were, as is known, often granted to musicians and poets who celebrated in their works the sanctuary and the God of Delphi.

But this Delphic inscription is not only interesting for the information it gives about the connexion of the great poets of the Hellenistic world with Delphi. It also sheds light on the authenticity and interpretation of a Hellenistic poem, which has unfortunately come down to us in a very corrupt condition. This is an *Elegy on Posidippus*, first published by Diels in *Sitz. d. k. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss., Berlin*, 1898, pp. 845 f. Diels and all the subsequent editors and commentators of this poem⁴ have held it to be the work of an inferior poet, or even the simple exercise in verse of a Greek of the first century A.D. who lived in Egyptian Thebes. In particular they were puzzled by the obscure, and apparently irrelevant, lines 9-14, in which a reference was obviously made to Delphi and to an oracle of Apollo which was to celebrate the poet.

These are:

- 9 Καὶ σὺ Ποσειδῖππὸν ποτ' ἐφίλα(ο) Κύνθιε, Λητοῦς
 ὕ(ι)έ...
 [at least one line missing]
 † φημητῖν φημεν τοικεα του παριου†⁵
 τοῖν ἐκ Κρίσσης⁶ τε καὶ ἐξ ἀδύτων καναχῆσαις]
 φωνῇν † αθανηνωττα, καὶ [...]⁷† ἐμοῦ
 ὄφρα με τιμήσωσι Μακηδόνας οἱ τ' ἐπὶ νήσ[ων],

¹ Now published by Klaffenbach in *I.G.* ix. 1, no. 16 A, ll. 24 f.: Προξενίῃ πω τῶ ἐπυραγματοποιῶι Πελλαίωι.

² ll. 9-10:

Ξελεύκωι [c. 14 l.] Ποσειδῖππωι [- - - -]
 7 vac. Ασκληπιάδῃ 11 vac. Δ4 Q K [- - -].
 Each line consists of about forty letters.

³ See Flacelière, *Les Aitolians à Delphes*, pp. 179 f.

⁴ See bibliography in D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, i, p. 470. All details on the hand and readings in Schubart, *Symbolae philologicae* O. A. Danielsson octogenario dicatae, Upsala, 1932, pp. 290 f.

⁵ Schubart reads: φήμη, τῇ νύφοντ' οἰκία τοῦ Παρίου; and Diels φήμην, τὴν ἡφῖεντ' οἰκία τοῦ Παρίου. Both are unconvincing.

⁶ Κρίσσης Trypanis: χρῆσον Tablet: ἐκχρήσαις... καναχῆσαις Schubart.

⁷ Schubart suggests: ἀθα(νά)την ὥτια καὶ [κα]τ'; Diels ἀθα(νά)την, ἀνα, καὶ [τε]τ'. Both are impossible. I should like to suggest ἀθανάτην, ὦ ἀνα, καὶ [πο]τ'. The Doric form of πρὸς (ποτ) is tenable, because Posidippus occasionally uses Doric forms. See also Weinreich, op. cit., p. 439. ὦ ἀνα was suggested by Beazley.

15 οἱ τ' Ἀοῖς πάσης γείτονες ἡμόνος.
Πελλαῖον γένος ἄμὸν κτλ.

But the poem should now be seen as a genuine work of Posidippus and lines 9-11 must certainly be connected with the *promanteia* which Delphi had granted to that poet in the psephisma already mentioned. This must be the meaning of the *φωνή* which the God of Delphi is asked to pronounce. Moreover, the mention of the name of the poet twice in that elegy¹ as well as that of his native city Pella,² the biographical details included, and the striking coincidence of a number of usages with those which occur in his admittedly genuine poetry³ certainly show that behind the corrupt and mutilated text we now possess (a text which has come down to us on two wooden wax-covered tablets in the hand of an illiterate schoolboy) stand the verses of the great Posidippus—possibly his last verses written in very old age. That this elegy is a genuine work by Posidippus and not an exercise in verse of the first century A.D. can be seen also from l. 21, *μηδέ τις οὖν χεῖραι δάκρυον*, which has been imitated by Ennius in his epigram (l. 3-4), 'nemo me lacrimis decoret nec funera fletu / faxit'.

The biographical information that we can draw from these data is indeed important. We now know that Posidippus lived till a very advanced age (the *καὶ σὺ Ποσειδῖππὸν ποτ' ἐφίλα* of l. 9 suggests that he died long after 276/275), that he had children and wealth, and a great panhellenic reputation even during his lifetime. If, as appears probable from the Delphic inscription, he composed poetry at the same time as Asclepiades for the God and sanctuary of Delphi, we have yet another argument in favour of Reitzenstein's view that those two poets were inclined to treat the same subjects, and may even have proceeded to a common edition of certain of their works.⁴ Perhaps it would not be too bold to suggest that they may even have visited Delphi together, for the Delphians, as we can see from their inscriptions, bestowed these honorary psephismata mostly on people who had visited their city and duly honoured its God at his sanctuary.

Exeter College, Oxford

C. A. TRYPANIS

LUCAN i. 76-77

tellus extendere litora nolet
excutietque fretum.

THE final hour of the universe and return to primeval chaos. Of the numerous interpretations of this passage none in any way convinces. The difficulty lies in the inappropriate sense of the words *excutietque fretum*, which can only mean 'and will shake off the sea'. In the return to primeval chaos the earth will have no such power; on the contrary, she will suffer inundation; cf. vii. 134 ff. 'quis litora ponto / obruta, quis summis cernens in montibus aequor / . . . tot rerum finem, timeat sibi?' Lucan here reflects the Stoic belief in the ultimate inundation; compare (with Professor Getty) Sen. *N.Q.* iii. 27 ff.

Apart from their being unsuited to the general context, the words seem to be in contradiction to *tellus extendere litora nolet*, the natural meaning of which is

¹ ll. 5 and 9.

² l. 16.

⁴ See Reitzenstein, *Epigramm u. Skolion*, pp. 95 f.

³ See Schubart, *op. cit.*, p. 297, n. 1.

'the earth will refuse to stretch out her shores', i.e. with which to protect herself from the sea¹ (cf. Claud. *Rufin.* i. 10 '(deus) porrexerit undis / litora'); shores, indeed, there will be none, as indicated in vii. 134 (above) 'litora ponto obruta'; so in Deucalion's time, v. 623-4 'cum mare conuoluit gentes, cum litora Tethys / noluit ulla pati caelo contenta teneri' (cf. v. 75), Ov. *Met.* i. 292 'omnia pontus erant, deerant quoque litora ponto'.² In an attempt to remove the contradiction some editors derive from the words *extendere l. n.* a meaning which is strained and unnatural: thus Housman explains 'desinet in planitiem porrigere, erigere incipiet' (followed by Duff³); still less successful are Lejay⁴ and Bourgery.⁵ But whatever meaning is assigned to the words, the general impropriety of *excusietque fretum* remains.⁶ Certain other editors seek to put matters right by misinterpreting the latter expression: some (e.g. Haskins, so Heidland in *Introd.*) assume that the negative force of *noluit* is continued in the following clause, but are unable to give any parallel for so striking a usage in the case of *nolo*; nor can we be impressed by Professor Getty's assurance that 'the editors fail to see that *fretum* is nominative and not accusative . . . , and that *litora* is the object of *excusiet* as well as of *extendere* by an ἀπό κοινοῦ construction'.⁸ No more comfort is to be found in the tangled explanations of the earlier editors ('in ipso Chao, Chaos' observes Glareanus with justice).

There can, I think, be little doubt that the text is unsound, but no convincing emendation has been proposed; certainly, neither Bentley's *quaeret* for *noluit* nor Christ's *excurretque* for *excusietque* carries any conviction. What we look for is in place of *excusiet* a verb governing *fretum* which has an opposite sense. The right reading, I suggest, is *excipietque*, i.e. 'and will admit, give entry to, the sea'. That the two verbs were liable to confusion (as antonyms not unnaturally are) is suggested by the following passages (cited by *Thes.*): Sen. *Herc. O.* 1384 *excusans* E for *excipiens* A, Virg. *Aen.* xii. 532 *excipit* M for *excusit* PR, Ov. *Met.* xii. 98 *excipit* most manuscripts for *excusit*.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

¹ For the use of *extendere* compare ii. 434 '(Appenninus) extendit . . . suas in templa Lacinia rupes', Ov. *Met.* i. 43 'iussit et extendi campos, subsidere ualles'.

² Bentley compares Luc. iv. 429 'iamque relabenti crescebant litora ponto'.

³ Who translates 'and earth, refusing to spread her shores out flat, will shake off the ocean', and explains 'i.e. she will heave them up'. Francken, though he interprets differently, also sees a reference to the upsurge of mountains and refers to Sen. *Dial.* vi. 26. 6 '(uetustas) totos supprimet montes et alibi rupes in altum nouas exprimet; maria sorbebit, flumina auertet'; but see below.

⁴ He renders *extendere l.* as 'tenir les rivages étendus autour des mers' and explains that 'd'après cette description, le bouleversement sera causé par la tentative de chaque élément de se substituer à celui qui lui est

opposé: . . . la terre secouera la mer, comme un vêtement dont on se débarrasse'.

⁵ No less strangely 'la terre ne voudra plus garder la ligne de ses rivages et chassera la mer'.

⁶ It is to be noted that in Sen. *Dial.* vi. 26. 6 (quoted above) the earth will do anything but shake off the sea, as the succeeding words make clear: 'inundationibus quicquid habitatur obducet necabitque omne animal orbe submerso'.

⁷ An example of the normal usage is iv. 433 '*noluit* Illyricae custos Octavius undae / confestim temptare ratem, celeresque carinas / continuit' ('but held back').

⁸ What Lucan wrote was Latin and the above text is not Latin for 'the land will refuse to stretch out its coast-line, the restraint of which the sea will throw off' (so Professor Getty).

NOTES ON JUVENAL

(1) 9. 76

NAEVOLUS, the piratical man of all work, is explaining how he saved his patron Virro's marriage from breaking up on the wedding-night:

fugientem saepe puellam
 amplexu rapui; tabulas quoque ruperat et iam
 signabat: tota uix hoc ego nocte redemi.

Something must be wrong with *signabat*. If the bride had already torn up the marriage contract, she could not be signing it a little later (*iam*). And *tabulas ruperat et signabat* cannot mean 'she had destroyed one document and was now signing another document'. It is wildly improbable on the face of it that the disappointed woman, after tearing up her marriage-lines on her wedding-night, would be negotiating a marriage with somebody else while still in her bridegroom's house; and the Latin makes it quite impossible.

Weidner proposed that *signabat* meant 'she was signing a declaration of divorce'—but the essential noun is lacking. The scholiast conjectured she was making a new will—which is the invention of desperation.

Let us read *migrabat*. She was leaving the house of her impotent bridegroom for good—one of the decisive steps in a divorce. The act is also known as *discedere* and *deserere* (E. Levy, *Der Hergang der römischen Ehescheidung*, Weimar, 1925, pp. 5-8); Juvenal himself calls it *exire* in 6. 146-7, *regna relinquere* in 6. 224, and *migrare* again in 6. 171.

It might be objected that *migrabat* merely repeats *fugientem*, but that would be a misunderstanding. In the earlier stages the bride was merely rushing out in a huff and a dressing-gown, to spend the night at a hotel. But *quoque* shows that her later decision was more serious: 'furthermore' she was going to leave Virro for good, tearing up the marriage-lines and returning bag and baggage to her own home.

The cause of the corruption was either the misreading of *r*, making *mignabat*, which was then falsely corrected into *signabat*; or else a deliberate alteration by an editor who misunderstood the point. (*Signarat*, a further distortion, appears in one manuscript.)

There are two different scholia on the passage. The second has been mentioned above: 'signabat tabulas, siue alio ut nubat siue alium uolens facere heredem'—which is an attempt to explain the corruption. But the first looks as though it had been written before the corruption appeared:

dotales tabulas frangentem (= ruperat)
 et repudium uolentem tibi dare (= migrabat) saepius reuocauit.

Here as elsewhere the scholia show us glimpses of the very earliest stage in the history of Juvenal's text.

(2) 12. 31

Juvenal's friend the merchant Catullus was caught in a storm. The ship filled and began to roll dangerously, so much so that the experienced pilot could not save it from the risk of foundering. Catullus had to order his valuable cargo to be jettisoned.

cum plenus fluctu medius foret alueus et iam
 alternum puppis latus euerterentibus undis
 arboris incertae nullam prudentia cani
 rectoris cum ferret opem, decidere iactu
 coepit cum uentis . . .

incertae P al.: *incerta* F: *incerto* P² Q: *incerti* A al.

The difficulty is that both *puppis* and *arboris* seem to be genitives attached to *latus*. The scholiast does not help. Editors have tried various solutions, emending to *arbori incertae* (which sounds hideous), calling *arboris* a genitive of definition, and so on.

Let us take *puppis* to be an interlinear gloss on the difficult expression *arboris*, and excise it. What should go into its place? Clearly an adjective agreeing with *undis*. We might try *saevis*—used of hail in 5. 78 and of the Alps in 10. 166, and actually coupled with *undis* by Lucr. 5. 222.

alternum saevis latus euerterentibus undis
 puppis
 arboris incertae, nullam prudentia cani

What the original adjective was, no one now can tell, except that it began with a consonant and ended in *-is*. But now the sentence reads and construes smoothly, and the corruption is explained.

After working this out, I discovered that Ruperti in 1803 had proposed a similar solution, though without much conviction ('nisi malis pro *puppis* reponere in *puppi*, vel *tumidis*, vel *curuis*') and without suggesting the cause of the corruption. No notice seems to have been taken of his conjecture, and it is a pleasure to help in bringing it to light.

Columbia University, New York

GILBERT HIGHET

AGAMEMNON, 1. 404

403-8 λιποῦσα δ' ἀστοῖσιν ἀσπίστορας
 κλόνους ἑλογχίμους τε καὶ ναυβάτας
 ὀπλιαμούς,
 ἀγούσά τ' ἀντίφερον Ἰλῖω φθορὰν
 βεβᾶκει ῥίμφα διὰ
 πυλᾶν, ἄτλατα τλᾶσα . . .

THE problem of the obelized words is discussed fully by Fraenkel (*Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, Oxford, 1950, ii. 210-13). The chief objections to the manuscript text are that metrical correspondence requires υ---υ and that τε is not used (at least by Aeschylus and Sophocles) to connect two adjectives qualifying the same noun and disposed before and after it. Fraenkel rightly rejects the emendations of Ahrens and others, and concludes: 'I am obliged to let the text of the manuscripts stand unaltered, though I cannot consider it to be sound.'

I propose λοχισμούς τε καὶ; tr. '... the clatter of foot-soldiers and marshalling of companies and equipment of seamen'.

For λοχισμός, cf. λοχίζω 'form companies':

Herodotus i. 103. 1 καὶ πρῶτός τε ἐλόχισε κατὰ τέλεα τοὺς ἐν τῇ Αἰόλῳ. The verb is used with this meaning, as well as that of 'ambush', in later prose (see LSJ, s.v. II), but the noun seems to recur only in Plutarch, *Philopoemen* 13. 9, where it means 'ambuscade' (pl.). Λοχίτης is found in Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1650, *Cho.* 768, in the sense of 'comrade-in-arms'.

The corruption λογχίμους, which is a *hap. leg.*, would arise easily from the context. It is worth observing also that there is an Ionic noun λόγχη, connected with λαγχάνω, λάχος, which occurs in inscriptions and is glossed by Hesychius as λῆξις, μέρλις, and further that λόγχη 'spear' is used collectively by Sophocles and Euripides to mean 'company', 'regiment' (see LSJ, s.vv.).

A. J. BEATTIE

University of Edinburgh

LONGINUS, *ARS RHETORICA*, p. 561 Walz

σαντὸν γὰρ οὐ θήσεις οὐδ' εἰσώσεις ἴδιον νόμον φ' (ὡν libri, ὡς Ald., corr. Bake) δεῖ

προσμένειν· οὐ γὰρ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ὁ νόμος τῶν λόγων, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ νόμῳ.

FOR προσμένειν read προσμένειν; cf. Gal. 15. 436 μέχρι πολλοῦ ταῖς αὐτῶν ἀγωγαῖς ἑκαστοι προσμένουσιν ('persevere in—stick to—their treatment').

With στανὸν γὰρ οὐ θήσῃς understand νόμον. The association νέμειν—νόμος explains the corruption.

D. A. REES

University College, Bangor

SEATS IN THE EARLY ROMAN THEATRE

PROFESSOR W. BEARE in *The Roman Stage* (Methuen, 1950), Appendix A (= C.R. liii. 51–55), concludes, on the basis of internal evidence, that there were seats in the early Roman theatre. I believe his conclusion is supported by Cicero, *De Amicitia* 24 *stantes plaudabant in re ficta*.

Fensterbusch discusses the external evidence in P.-W. s.v. 'Theatron' (III b), but does not include this reference, perhaps because he regards it as ambiguous. According to F. Conway, ad loc., some render the sentence 'the bystanders cheered . . .'. It seems, however, that *stantes* is not elsewhere used substantivally to mean 'bystanders' in the sense of 'spectators'. It is not so used in the passages quoted by Fensterbusch;¹ and to get this meaning Chr. Wordsworth² emended *stantes* to *spectantes*. There would not be much point in using *stantes* to denote the spectators in the theatre, since the people in the auditorium would not thus be distinguished from the actors on the stage, who were generally standing.

Two possibilities remain: 'as they stood they cheered' or 'they stood and cheered'. The participle might have a present meaning if it bore special emphasis as referring to a practice different from the contemporary one—'standing (as they then used to)'—on the assumption that Cicero is looking from his own point of view, and not from that of Laelius, in this allusion to a play by Pacuvius. But in favour of giving the participle an aoristic meaning is the fact that there are

¹ Val. Max. ii. 4. 2; Liv. *epit.* xlviii *populusque aliquandiu stans ludos spectavit*; Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 20 *stantem populum spectavisse*. In these cases the participle is adjectival.

² Cited by J. S. Reid ad loc. from a note by Shilleto.

other theatrical references to people standing up and cheering. J. S. Reid quotes some of these, one of which is from Cicero (*Att.* ii. 19. 3 *Curioni stantes plauserant*), where the close parallel is an open invitation to take the reference in the *De Amicitia* in the same way. This letter to Atticus was written before 55 B.C., when the Pompeian theatre, well known for its seats, was built; so was the *Pro Sestio*, which refers (124)³ to seats in a gladiatorial show at the theatre.

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

University College, Swansea

SUETONIUS, *VESP.* 22.

'expugnatus autem a quadam, quasi amore suo deperiret, cum perductae pro concubitu sestertia quadringenta donasset, admonente dispensatore quem ad modum summam rationibus uellet inferri, "Vespasiano", inquit, "adamato".'

THE *bons mots* of the ancients are not always readily intelligible to moderns and the point of Vespasian's waggery as recorded above by Suetonius has been subject to misunderstanding. It does not, I think, lie in the pun detected by Mr. T. L. Zinn in his note in C.R., lxxv, 1951, p. 10. He imputes, indeed, whimsical conduct to the emperor. He suggests that Vespasian does not avail himself of the lady's offer, but instead of doing so (*pro concubitu*) takes it into his head to make her a present of 400,000 sesterces, 'the greatness of the sum', notes Mr. Zinn, 'adding to the humour of the situation'; and that *adamato* represents a pun on ἀδαμάτω ('to keeping Vesp. a virgin'). That the parsimonious and hard-headed Vespasian should reward the lady for no more than a display of goodwill is in itself hard to believe, but Mr. Zinn's view seems further ruled out by these considerations: (1) *expugnatus* clearly means that the lady achieved her desire ('he yielded to the assaults of a certain lady', Zinn rightly); what else could it mean? (2) The only natural sense of *pro* here is 'in payment for', while *perductae* means not merely 'when she was brought into his presence' (Zinn) but 'after being brought to bed' (cf. *Tib.* 45 'perductam nec quicquam amplius pati constantissime recusantem delatoribus obiect').

³ See Beare, op. cit. 236. Reid's suggestion that there is a 'small anachronism' in the *De Amic.* passage will now have to be rejected.

(3) A most p
Ves
it mus
testati
who w

1 A
viz. ad

DAVI
Press

THE
schola
first h
Thuc
but th
buildi
mater
line, l
they c
religio
super
reject
coher
is pos
delusi
he tak
on the
Spart
of bot
praise
in an
others
and o
two e
was b
debat
first s
out, th

The ty
associa
politic
of the p

(g) A pun of such calibre would tax even the most pun-conscious.¹

Vespasian's quip—and certainly a quip it must be—must hinge on the lady's protestations of love; it was she, so it appeared, who was dying of love for Vespasian, not he

¹ A pun was detected also by Marcilius, viz. *ad(h)amato*.

of love for her; and the point lies in the *παρά προσδοκίαν*. A straightforward entry in the emperor's expenditure account would specify the name of his innamorata. In the circumstances Vespasian substituted his own name, viz. *Vespasiano adamato*, i.e. 'to the loving of Vespasian'.

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

REVIEWS

THUCYDIDES AND PLATO

DAVID GRENE: *Man in His Pride*. Pp. xiv+231. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1950. Cloth, 30s. net.

THE title is misleading: first, by its picturesqueness, for the book is a work of scholarship; and secondly because it would seem to be applicable only to the first half of the book. Mr. Grene gives us a study in the political philosophy of Thucydides and Plato (the book is almost equally divided between the two), but the title belongs only to Thucydides' picture of the self-reliant Athenians building up their power and using it, with indeed the necessary aid of certain material resources, land, silver-mines, a good harbour, and convenient coastline, but beyond that with no help from outside, from the gods, confident that they could do everything. (Yet, the author might have added, the absence of religious feeling did not lead, as it has done in other societies, to a grosser superstition—an exclusive belief in magic or idolatry of individual men.) He rejects Jebb's view that it is not possible, from the text of Thucydides, to 'form a coherent system of doctrine'—a theory of politics; he adopts Shorey's, that this is possible, but not his too simple picture of the 'ethical positivist' with no delusions. He stresses, wisely, Thucydides' intellectual isolation in his own day; he takes into account (it is curious that it should be worth noting) the chapters on the moral effects of the pestilence and of *stasis* as well as Athenian speeches at Sparta and Camarina and the Melian dialogue; he tries to explain the praise of both Nicias and Antiphon (he might in this context have compared the praise both of the *σωφροσύνη* of Chios and of the daring of Athens). He writes in an interesting way. Yet I do not find his conclusions more convincing than others; and, it seems to me, there is much misunderstanding both of history and of Thucydides, and some serious mistranslations. I can only give one or two examples, out of many. The political morality of the individual Athenian was but a reflex of the morality of the State (see, for example, the Mytilene debate, where, however, Grene forgets that the citizens felt remorse for their first savage action), and it was a natural consequence, as Plato later pointed out, that the democracy should end in a tyranny—

The tyranny which . . . took shape tentatively in Alcibiades and actually in Critias and his associates was a philosophically conceived monstrosity bred of the collapse of any collective political morality but an exact replica in the tyrant himself of the dimensions and quality of the political morality of the Athenian state for nearly eighty years.

Alcibiades and Critias lasted but a short time, it is true; but the democracy of the fourth century was not only degenerate but 'never in fact alive, theoretically', as is

clear even from its own spokesmen, Demosthenes and Isocrates. In a real historical sense Plato's sketch of the degenerate states is true: the logical end of the political process in Athens was the tyranny.

I would interpret things differently. Alcibiades *failed* to make himself tyrant (if he ever wanted to, which is not quite certain): the democracy was too strong for him; Critias was only installed by a foreign power, and even so was soon overthrown. There is no logical end to the democracy here; and Plato was surely thinking of Syracuse rather than of Athens. For the fourth century—Demosthenes had many faults, but at least he was *alive*; yet Grene can only see 'the dry bones clad in whatever rags and shreds of political propaganda happen to fit'.

Secondly, for Thucydides himself: for him 'the issue of freedom and slavery is old-fashioned and insignificant'; so are 'the issues of the Persian Wars'; and 'it is hard not to feel that Thucydides is in agreement with the Thebans in their contention against the people of Plataea that what they did in the Persian Wars has no bearing on their political position in the contemporary world'. I find nothing is easier; and if an issue is insignificant why does the historian allow so much space to it? Consider this on Thucydides' expression of pity for the fate of Mycalessus:

Is it not strange that the man who records the total destruction of Melos . . . and the almost complete destruction of Mytilene, and the execution of the Plataeans . . . should have had not one word of pity for the victims or blame for the executioners and reserve this pity and blame for the murder of a few hundred villagers and a schoolhouse of children in Boeotia?

How should we read Thucydides? He gives less than two pages to the Mycalessus episode, twenty-five each to Plataea and Mytilene and eight to Melos, including five impressive speeches and the dialogue all concerned with political morality; and we are to conclude that he was not interested in the moral issue, which, for him, was insignificant compared with the *necessity* of the non-moral rule of strong over weak! Grene's own view is that the historian's 'almost unique' interest in Mycalessus, like his interest in the fate of Nicias and the success of Theramenes' constitutional experiment, is due to an element of chance and free will in these events which particularly moved him: there is some truth in this in regard to Mycalessus, but as a theory to explain all it is as perverse as any I have seen. He will not allow that Thucydides may be revealing a personal humanity or point of view, because he was more historian than philosopher (he is right in this, and it was worth saying), and only one who is more philosopher than historian, like Hegel, is to be permitted such a revelation.

We read a good deal about 'historical necessity', and such views as that 'war is the final step in social development for Thucydides': the *archaeologia* therefore 'is the story of an entire nation moving inevitably to the great moment of war'. (On the contrary, it is the story of material and political progress, the growth of wealth and military resources: these made the war, when it came, *ἀξιολογώτατον*; but not inevitable.) We find that Thucydides 'sneers at Homer', when he uses his evidence just as we do; the theory that he disliked democracy is illustrated by translating *κατείχε τὸ πλῆθος ἐλευθέρως*, 'to him

the p
demo
the m
enjoy
as you
2-3.

I h
I hav
the p
to the
of Pla
the in
questi
the go
ever p
critici
a mis
failure
State,
a very
of the
dema
A b

Univers

D. H
Inleid
Pp. 6

THIS I
series
down
and a
with b
ancien
major
this is
Ueber
compa

The
been e
1933.
openba
explain
problem
philoso
(New T

the people, though free, were subjects' (this in 'a naked and unqualified democracy'), and $\delta \delta\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ 'the mob' (viii. 86. 5); and, most surprising of all, the materialistic appeal of Pericles to his fellow citizens not only by 'you can enjoy the whole world's goods here in Athens', but by 'you may live your lives as you please, and no one will interfere', which is given as the meaning of ii. 37. 2-3. (This is quoted later, and not so badly mishandled, on p. 228.)

I have left myself little space in which to deal with the chapters on Plato, and I have little competence to do so. Again there is much of interest, especially on the paradox of the dialogue as a form of *mimesis* in relation to Plato's attitude to the mimetic arts; on the development both of the form of the dialogue and of Plato's thought (in this last he owes much, as he says, to Cherniss); and on the influence of Socrates' personality on Plato. And again there is much to question, especially when he almost asserts that the rulers in the *Republic*, once the good state is established, are to be priests (and Greek priests at that) for ever performing a ritual, not philosophers; and many individual statements to criticize, as a minor mistranslation of *Epist.* vii. 325 c on p. 131 which leads to a misleading description of democratic procedure two pages later, and a failure to notice that in the *Crito* we have not so much Socrates' attitude to the State, but his (and therefore, in one sense, Plato's) attitude to Athens, which is a very different thing. And surely *Rep.* 493 a-c does not give the same picture of the demos and its leaders as Thucydides iii. 38 (spoken, incidentally, by a demagogue)?

A book, however, which spurs one's own thought.

University of Glasgow

A. W. GOMME

THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

D. H. T. VOLLENHOVEN: *Geschiedenis der Wijsbegeerte*. Eerste Band, *Inleiding en Geschiedenis der Grieksche Wijsbegeerte voor Platoon en Aristoteles*. Pp. 618; chart in pouch at back. Franeker: Wever, 1950. Cloth, 25 g.

THIS large and handsomely produced volume is intended to be the first of a series of ten by the same author, covering the whole history of philosophy down to the present day. Three volumes will be devoted to Greek Philosophy and a fourth to early Christian thinkers. The present volume is amply supplied with bibliographies at the end of each section and with detailed references to ancient sources, and one might suppose that here we have the first part of a major work of scholarship. But it must be regretfully stated at the outset that this is not the case, and closer inspection reveals a world of difference from Ueberweg-Praechter, with which the above account may seem to suggest comparison.

The ultimate basis of the work is theological, and the method is said to have been expounded in the author's *Het Calvinisme en de Reformatie van de Wijsbegeerte*, 1933. The history of philosophy is regarded as a process of revelation, *Woord-openbaring*. This leads to what is called the *probleemhistorische methode*, which is explained as an attempt to trace out the objective order of the themes and problems which have influenced Western thought. On this view the history of philosophy falls into three periods—pre-Synthetic (pre-Christian), Synthetic (New Testament to the Renaissance), and post-Synthetic. The main problem

of pre-Synthetic philosophy was the status of law in relation to the Cosmos. Two views were possible: (1) non-realist, law existing only within the Cosmos—this is typical of the period from Musaeus to Aristippus with which the present volume is concerned; (2) realist, law existing independently of the Cosmos. Within this framework the 'objective order' (*zakelijke orde*) cuts clean across the chronological order in early Greek philosophy. Two independent schemes of classification enable each thinker to be given an elaborate philosophic label which distinguishes him completely from every other thinker. Thus Parmenides, for example, is a non-mythologizing, pure cosmological dualist, non-empiricist, without dichotomy in his anthropology, i.e. non-spiritualist. The last term distinguishes him from, among others, Epicharmus, Hippias, and Melissus, who share the earlier terms with him. Parmenides is also a non-realistic, objective, non-mathematical universalist, the last term distinguishing him from Zeno.

Even where this over-elaborate classification is suggestive, as it sometimes is, it is stated with extreme dogmatism and brevity, and at best would require much more discussion and justification than are offered. Its effects on the present work seem almost wholly bad. First of all, the sections of the book follow one another according to the system of classification. As a consequence the majority of the Sophists are dealt with earlier than Parmenides, and Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans not only come after Parmenides but after Socrates as well. Such an arrangement is destructive not only of the history of philosophy in the traditional form, but even of any history of philosophical problems, as no attempt is made to show how one view led to another. In fact what is here offered is not a history of philosophy at all, but an extended essay in the classification of types of philosophy, with many early Greek thinkers rather unfortunately selected as examples of types arrived at by dichotomy. It is this interest which determines the detailed exposition of the views of particular thinkers, and it may be worth while to quote as an example the conclusion of the discussion of Heraclitus—'Zoo houdt H. als de kosmogono-kosmologisch denkende monist in het universalistische subjectivisme het midden tussen Thales en Hesiodos'.

A feature of the book is the large amount of space devoted to minor thinkers. An immense amount of industry has gone into its making and the author has a wide knowledge of modern writings on the Pre-Socratics. The bibliographies are convenient and up to date and cover articles as well as books. One can only regret that the principles upon which the work is based will so largely impair its value.

University of Manchester

G. B. KERFERD

THE ELEATICS

JEAN ZAFIROPULO: *L'École éléate. Parménide, Zénon, Mélissos*. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 304. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.

THIS interesting book attempts to interpret the Eleatics in the light of certain general ideas, expounded more fully in the author's *Anaxagore de Clazomène*, Paris, 1948. The main thesis may be stated as follows: all early Greek thought

was animistic, and consequently for it everything that was real involved the union of a soul with a body. However, the soul so united with a body is itself material. This is the key to the understanding of Parmenides' poem. On an animistic view there are two kinds of knowledge: (1) soul knows soul directly (contemplation); (2) through the senses we know the corporeal form of things, but cannot know their soul. For Parmenides the way of truth leads to knowledge of the soul of things, the way of opinion to knowledge of their corporeal forms only. Consequently the way of opinion is false as being partial and omitting the soul element in things.

At this point two objections occur to the reader. Parmenides' Being is expressly deprived of motion and there is nothing to suggest that he thought of it as an unmoved mover. So while it may well stand to phenomena as soul stands to body, it is itself very unlike an animistic soul. (Here no help can be derived from Plato, *Soph.* 249 a, which there is no reason to suppose refers to Eleatic doctrine.) Secondly, if the way of opinion is false, as being incomplete, so also should the way of truth be false, for the same reason. But on reading farther we find that this second objection misses the mark. For Zafiropulo the Being of the Eleatics combines within itself both the soul element and the material element. The material element is that which appears in the world of the senses, the soul element 'compense en quelque sorte le devenir de l'apparence pour former avec elle un tout qui se conserve immuable pour l'éternité' (p. 66). Later (p. 71), we are told that this soul 'par son action propre' neutralizes all becoming, in virtue of its own semi-materiality. But there is nothing about this in the fragments of Parmenides, and one is left with the feeling that the animistic soul, if it involves all this, is a hindrance rather than a help in understanding Parmenides' position. The correct analogy is surely something much simpler—as soul might be said to be the most real element in an animistic world, so Parmenides' Being is the reality underlying the illusory world of the senses.

There is, however, very much more to the book than simply the theme of animism. The general view taken of the history of Eleaticism is that Parmenides as a 'dissident Pythagorean' substituted continuity as a fundamental principle for Pythagorean discontinuity, while keeping the latter in the way of opinion. Zeno was concerned to show that discontinuity leads to insoluble paradoxes in questions involving division of space and time. Melissus represents the culminating point in the history of the movement, and came close to the conception of a four-dimensional universe, though he lacked the language in which to express such a conception. All this is firmly based on detailed discussion of surviving fragments which will need to be considered at greater length than is possible here. Indeed to many this will probably prove the most valuable part of the book.

Texts and translations are given for each of the three Eleatics, and a number of detailed points are discussed in appendixes. There is no index. Misprints are very frequent, especially in the notes, where Bowra has become Brown, and other proper names are often mutilated. An awkward system of cross-references is used for referring forwards in the text. Thus on p. 50, note 6 reads 'voir note 43', while note 43 reads 'voir note 6'. This is a regular feature throughout the book.

University of Manchester

G. B. KERFERD

PLATO AND FREUD

MICHAEL LANDMANN: *Elenktik und Maieutik*. Drei Abhandlungen zur antiken Psychologie. Pp. 141. Bonn: Bouvier, 1950. Paper, DM. 6.

EACH of these three essays on ancient psychology follows the same plan, passing lightly from the consideration of ancient texts to the discussion of psycho-analytic methods and theories. Thus the last essay begins with good general remarks on Theophrastus' *Characters* and its possible relationships with comedy and rhetoric, but is found to be concerned in the main with 'polyphrenia' or the disunity of the personality. The first essay, which contains the same mixture in a different proportion, gives its title to the book. It discusses the two sides of the Socratic 'elenchus', the 'cathartic' and the 'maieutic'. Landmann regards Socrates as the founder of philosophy because of his discovery of philosophic ignorance and his attempts to disseminate it by the technique of asking questions, the only technique open to one who was consciously ignorant himself. But the pupil who is thus purged of his 'vain conceit of wisdom' does not contract scepticism, for scepticism implies disbelief in the competence of our knowing faculties. In becoming conscious of his ignorance he not only reawakens his desire for knowledge, a desire which, Landmann argues, must be innate if ignorance is involuntary, but also brings to light, 'is reminded of', the latent knowledge which he lost at birth. It will be seen that Landmann treats these two sides of Socrates' activity as two 'aspects' of the one method. It would accord better with the texts to regard them as two successive stages in the progress of the pupil—so, for example, Cornford (*Plato's Theory of Knowledge*, p. 184), with whose work Landmann is not acquainted. Otherwise we are left with an unwarrantably optimistic view of what necessarily happens to the victims of Socratic *aporia*. What really interests Landmann, however, is the 'liberation', whether the liberation be from the false belief that one knows, or from the false belief that one does not know. He does not pause to consider that the art of 'writing upon the soul' depends on the teacher's ability to ask the *right* questions, and that this feat would be impossible for a Socrates so open-minded, or rather, empty-minded, as is here imagined. His object is to emphasize numerous 'points of contact' between the Socratic 'elenchus' and psycho-analytic method. Though he works hard at this task and has many interesting things to say, 'contact' is hardly the appropriate word for the juxtaposition which he produces. For the resemblances between the two things seem purely superficial. The differences are well known to Landmann himself: Socrates wished to elicit objective truth, not to reveal private and personal mythologies from the depths of the patient's unconscious; the ignorance which Socrates sought to dispel was 'involuntary', but psychic illness is often voluntary; and though Socrates could refer to the curative effects of his 'elenchus', he regarded the healing process as merely incidental to the acquisition of knowledge, whereas for the psycho-analyst intellectual enlightenment is wholly subordinate to the healing process.

In the second essay Socrates appears as the complete rationalist, absorbed in the ideal of 'giving a reasoned account' of one's beliefs and actions; his determination is *ἐπισταμένως ζῆν*, and, in spite of the oracle, dreams, and the 'divine sign', all varieties of inspiration are for him discredited by contrast with *τέχνη* and its clear-cut rules. Plato, on the other hand, is presented, after

Nietzsche, as an enthusiast rather than a logician. If Socrates called himself *ἐπαικός* he was thinking of *ἐπαῖος* rather than *ἐπῶς*. But with Plato philosophy becomes simply 'sublimated' *ἐπῶς*; and Platonic *ἐπῶς* is, Landmann thinks, irrational. In support of this theory of a conflict between Plato and his master's teachings he finds in Plato a growing emphasis on *θελα μοῖρα* and inspiration, and the admission that 'virtue' is possible without full knowledge. Here he fails to allow for the different senses of *ἀρετή* in Plato and the fact that Plato thought little of the 'demotic' variety. He concludes that philosophy is not 'born from itself' but from an irrational elemental force, the same force which in the *Phaedo* causes all things, animate and inanimate alike, to 'strive' to resemble their Forms; and it ends where it began, in the 'madness' of the philosophers. Here again the great gulf between the inspiration of soothsayers and poets on the one hand, and that of the Platonic philosopher on the other, is ignored. The former is of little or no value as compared with the latter, which has truth and reason as its offspring (*Rep.* 490 b). Nor is it true to say that the impulse by which 'every soul seeks the good' (*Rep.* 505 e) is in itself irrational. For this impulse is, strictly speaking, not a *vis a tergo* but a *vis a fronte*, and identical with the attractive power of absolute Good. Its source is therefore rational, though the rationality of its manifestations in different human souls depends on the kind of milieu in which it has to work.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

HIPPOCRATES IN ENGLISH

JOHN CHADWICK and W. N. MANN: *The Medical Works of Hippocrates*, A new translation from the original Greek made for English readers. Pp. 301. Oxford: Blackwell, 1950. Cloth, 20s. net.

THIS translation excludes the works of the Hippocratic *Corpus* that are: (1) concerned with surgery and obstetrics; (2) late; (3) similar to, or repetitions of, the works included, which are specimens of 'the work of a great physician'.

It is a joint version, made, revised, and then checked with the original. As far as possible modern medical English has been used, except where the result would be deceptive. The translators claim that the modern name of a disease has been avoided where there is no evidence that Hippocrates appreciated its morbid identity. But in one of their excellent indexes they refer to diphtheria, enteric, measles, and scarlet fever, but not to influenza. Now if these very infectious diseases existed in ancient times, why were they not endemic? Why do they only suggest themselves as possible explanations of isolated clinical histories which are recorded as unusual or remarkable? In the presence of such plagues, could any Greek have said, as is stated in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*, that 'fevers' are not infectious, but consumption is? Why should the voluminous treatises on medicine later than Hippocrates contain no descriptions of these diseases with suggested remedies, as they do of nearly every other modern disease?

The reviewer was once a passenger on a boat with another who for a week was isolated as suffering from typhoid. When a town was reached where microscopic examination was possible, the diagnosis was benignant tertian. If such confusion is possible today, the ancient descriptions which we think indicate enteric may really indicate malaria. On the other hand, it is a fact that in the

first book of *Epidemics* occurs a clear description of an epidemic of mumps, and yet mumps is not one of the diseases dealt with in later medical treatises. The whole question of ancient diseases is in a chaotic state, and would form a good subject for a M.D. thesis. Such a work would involve much training in diagnosis.

But this is merely a detail suggested by a study of an excellent translation, which is far better than would appear at first sight. It shows scholarship which might easily escape a reader's notice in the absence of notes. I will give one example only: in *Airs, Waters, Places*, ch. 22, the clever emendation of Mr. Chadwick, *πλούσιοι* for the *πλείστοι* of the manuscripts, is adopted without comment or mention. This is but one example out of many.

The non-medical reader will find much to interest him in the translation, the accuracy of which he can safely trust. It is, in fact, a pleasure to read for its scholarship and clarity. The reviewer noticed two places only where he felt a little doubt and uncertainty. Both are in *Ancient Medicine*. In ch. 20 'that the wine is the cause' is surely inadequate for *αὕτη δύναμις οἶνον καὶ αὐτὸς αἶρας* of the manuscripts, a difficult phrase in any case and probably corrupt. In ch. 22 *θώραξ* is almost certainly not 'chest' but 'trunk', 'torso'.

Lastly the reviewer would like to express his satisfaction that Hippocrates is being more appreciated after a long period of neglect.

Cambridge

W. H. S. JONES

THE CYNIC IDEAL

RAGNAR HÖISTAD: *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*. Pp. 234. Uppsala: privately printed (Oxford: Blackwell), 1949. Paper, 12s. net.

THIS work by a Swedish scholar is based on a doctorate thesis. It is written in excellent English for the most part. The ease of reading brings one up sharply against such usages as an adjective 'idea-historical' which once qualifies 'milieu'. There are also pleasanter naturalizations of Greek words: scholars 'polemise' against unacceptable judgements and Diogenes was an 'epigon'. Graceless as it must seem to cavil thus when foreign scholars pay us the compliment of writing in English, we must be on our guard against any formation of a scholars' argot.

Höistad is chiefly concerned to show how the Cynics idealized Heracles as a hero who won moral kingship by his toils, which were done for the sake of men in spite of their scorn. His evidence for 'service in face of scorn' is in Dio Chrysostom—Höistad has already written on 'a Hellenistic parallel to II Cor. vi. 3 ff.' His book would have been easier to read if he had made it a direct study of the relevant orations of Dio and had written two introductory essays, one on their debt to Antisthenes and the other on Lucian's treatment of Heracles and the Cynics. As it is, we have a learned but 'episodic' work. Höistad discusses many important questions and is alert and critical, but he leaps rather disconcertingly from one problem to another. The bibliography, full and useful as it is, emphasizes this discursiveness.

In the first twenty pages Höistad sets out the claim of Antisthenes to be regarded as the first Cynic and discusses his writings and those of Diogenes. He applauds Wilamowitz for dispelling the Antisthenic fog created by Dümmler, but claims that there is extant evidence for Antisthenes and that the *Symposium*

of Xenophon presents him in character, especially at iii. 8, 9 and iv. 34 ff. Antisthenes held to a distinctively individualist ethic and supported it (he supposed) with logic and paedagogic writing. Høistad believes that the works on Cyrus and Heracles (attributed to him by Diogenes Laertius) were used by Antisthenes to preach this ethic and he seeks to reconstruct something of the *Heracles* of Antisthenes out of Dio.

Høistad attacks Dudley's view that it is not historically possible that Diogenes was a pupil or follower of Antisthenes. He examines the numismatic evidence on which Seltman and Dudley rely and argues very clearly and convincingly that no such direct negative can be proved from the coins of Sinope. He also objects strongly to Sayre's view of Diogenes as a mere *sans culotte* and claims that his writings were as important as his *ἀναλδεια*. By a long analysis of Diogenes Laertius vi. 70, 71 he seeks to show (against von Fritz) that the *Περὶ ἀρετῆς* is genuine and that the reference to Heracles at the close of 71 is therefore of great importance. In general, he supports the traditional view that 'cynicism' can fairly be traced back through Antisthenes to Socrates himself, but he insists that Antisthenes is the first to stress *ἀσκησις* and *πόνος* which are the special 'sect words'. He notes in passing, but makes little of, Socrates' reference to himself as another Heracles at *Apol.* 22 a—but is not this casualness significant? He is not at all convincing when he uses the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon as evidence for the Cynics' picture of Cyrus, making Xenophon out to have been almost a Cynic in this work. This blurs the very distinction between Cynics and Socratics he has sought to make. He also makes the scanty evidence of the *Odysseus* of Antisthenes prove a Cynic use of the man of many wiles as a pattern of self-effacing service. But in spite of all this, he builds up a strong case for his main argument—that Antisthenes gave an individualist and paradoxical twist to Socratic and to Sophistic material alike, and that this special attitude was what later ages meant by 'cynicism'. Wallet and stick were its outward signs, and living in a *πίθος* was not a necessary part of it.

The most serious of Høistad's leaps is from Teles to Dio Chrysostom. On what may be called the 'tunnel period' of Cynicism we are offered only the table on p. 21 and stray remarks. But there is evidence of popular esteem of the true Cynic ideal and disparagement of its debasement in the epigrams of Leonidas (*A.P.* vi. 93, vii. 67), Antipater (vii. 65, xi. 158), and Honestus (vii. 66). Panaetius' opponents regarded 'cynicism' as a short cut to heaven—the steep ascent of heaven in fact—and Horace admits that *vagus Hercules* went that way.

The pages on Lucian (pp. 64–73) are excellent. He is shown as a Cynic at heart in spite of his gibes and the *De Morte Peregrini*. He criticizes vulgar *imitatio Herculis* but admires the Cynic ideal. The longer treatment of Dio shows in detail the further refinement of the Heracles ideal and argues that the Cynics contrasted Diogenes as the true king with Alexander as the apparent. Onesicritus failed to canonize Alexander among the Cynics.

University of Durham

J. B. SKEMP

AN INTRODUCTION TO PLOTINUS

JOSEPH KATZ: *Plotinus' Search for the Good*. Pp. ix+106. New York: King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 16s. net.

THIS is a scholarly little book, and an admirable introduction to Plotinus, soundly constructed upon the principle that 'one chief key to Platonism is to read its levels of reality as levels of value' (preface)—though, of course, not the only key.

A chapter on Plotinus' predecessors is followed by one on his mysticism, and this by an investigation of his levels of reality and of the soul's ascent to unity with the One. A final chapter, 'Science, Magic and Politics', is interesting as abandoning the beaten track of discussions of Neoplatonism. Katz gives us not exposition only, but sustained criticism that is penetrating without being unsympathetic; he is far from viewing Plotinus with the almost unqualified admiration and discipleship of Inge. The possibility of finding an objective basis for metaphysical construction in Plotinus' personal experiences is questioned, as is the theory of levels of reality with its inability to give a satisfactory account of the lower levels and of matter (pp. 43-45); and Katz argues (pp. 35-36) that 'Plotinus is caught between a cosmos-centered and a man-centered perspective'. He rejects, too, the conception of a movement in time beyond the temporal world, towards a fulfilment of the soul which seems to involve its negation. Readers will differ in the cogency they find in these criticisms. The last chapter deals in part with the notorious lack in Plotinus of any conception of man as a social and political being; Katz closes by remarking that the *Enneads* provide a guide-book for the salvation of man, and that 'ironically such guidance springs from a didactic concern for which Plotinus has perhaps little theoretical basis in his philosophy but by which he unwittingly gives honor to a social conception of man he has done so much to obscure' (p. 75).

It will be plain that this is a thoughtful volume. The chapter on Plotinus' predecessors, however, in particular leaves one wishing for more—though the size of the volume as a whole meant that it had to be kept within narrow bounds. Possible criticisms here are: (1) Insufficient attention is paid to Aristotle. Plotinus owed to him, besides his conception of actuality and potentiality, which Katz mentions (p. 4), a good deal of his psychology, and perhaps the ascription of a soul to plants (cf. *Enn.* iii. ii. 3). The notion of categories is Aristotelian, even though Plotinus goes for his to Plato. Katz does not mention that the semi-Platonic dialogues of Aristotle were extremely popular in Neoplatonic circles, and regarded as possessing almost as much authority as the works of the master; at *Enn.* iv. vii. 8 Plotinus echoes one of the most important fragments of the *Eudemus* (ff. 45 Rose, 7 Walzer), and Iamblichus' *Protrepticus* is largely taken from Aristotle's. (2) Not enough is said of the gradual assimilation of Academy, Peripatos, and Stoa in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods to provide a unified philosophical tradition from which only the Epicureans were excluded. Posidonius' criticisms of Chrysippus form an important stage in this movement, as do Antiochus of Ascalon and later Galen. Cicero provides another illustration. One of the few things we know of Plotinus' teacher Ammonius Saccas is that he is said to have synthesized Plato and

Aristotle. Later stages in the same process are to be found in Porphyry, and in the Neoplatonic commentators on Aristotle, such as Simplicius.

Katz wisely rejects the suggestion that Plotinus had political aims in his programme of personal salvation, and that it was intended to regenerate the empire of Gallienus. The *Enneads* are remarkably free from such a temper. He judiciously interprets the Platonopolis scheme as envisaging simply the establishment of a monastic community for philosophers (pp. 71-72). Pp. 26-28 are interesting on the influence of Neoplatonism on Christianity, which has been immense, and has had a notable representative in our own day in Dean Inge; but Katz might have mentioned that this influence has been recognized and yet, rightly or wrongly, rejected as inherently alien by theologians whose tendency has been in a more Hebraic direction.

At p. 77, n. 5, for 'Pl. *Ep.* ii. 323 E' read '312 E'. I cannot find the reference (p. 81, n. 75) to Reinhardt, *Kosmos und Sympathie*; is p. 254 n. intended?

University College, Bangor

D. A. REES

THE ATTICIST LEXICA

HARTMUT ERBSE: *Untersuchungen zu den Attizistischen Lexika*. (Abhandl. d. D. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Kl., Jahrg. 1949, No. 2.) Pp. 256. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950. Paper, DM. 37.

THIS work consists of a new edition of the fragments of the Atticist lexica used by Eustathius, with prolegomena, which marks a notable advance on Schwabe's, and will certainly supersede it. Whereas Schwabe confined himself to Eustathius, except for a few fragments from other sources quoting Aelius or Pausanias by name, Erbse has covered all the relevant literature, and is thus able to give fuller testimonia, a better text, and many more fragments—over 1,600 as against Schwabe's 450.

Our sources for the fragments, and the reasons for attributing them to Ael. or Paus., are discussed in the prolegomena. Erbse has a thorough mastery of his field, and is often convincing, though often too his speculations are bolder than his rare use of the asterisk of doubt in the text suggests, for example, his attribution of all the Thucydides-glosses in Photius to Aelius. (Occasionally, however, his doubts seem unfounded, e.g. P a 144 is better attested than P a 155.) Especially uncertain is his attempt to establish the individuality of Ael. and Paus.; though alive to the danger of seeing idiosyncrasies everywhere, he has not entirely escaped it. Wentzel's distinctions are broadly sound, but the differences between Ael. and Paus. are less marked than Erbse's prolegomena suggest, especially as regards proverbs, e.g. A a 79 = P a 70, and cf. P a 123, γ 8. Moreover, Eust.'s use of the plural *ἐν ῥητορικοῖς λεξικοῖς* (which Erbse might have mentioned in his testimonia at P a 95, 98) suggests some similarity between them. And his case for eliminating the Anonymus (pr. 30) is dubious; the argument from Photius's silence about an Anonymus can scarcely stand, and an Anonymus would be especially liable to be quoted simply as *λεξικὸν ῥητορικόν*.

The text is mostly well constructed, though there are superfluities and omissions in the apparatus (e.g. the alterations of *ποι-* to *πο-* (P a 8, 16) seem less significant than some made tacitly, e.g. A o 15). Erbse's judgement is generally

sound, though he sometimes makes insertions unnecessarily and inconsistently (e.g. cf. A α 176 with ε 67). Quotations should be extended only when a vital word is missing (cf. A α 136, ε 68 with Σ Ar. Eq. 414, Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 82). The *apparatus* is very accurate, and errors such as the attribution to Kinkel of a correction by Portus at P ε 83 are exceptional. The same praise may be given to the *testimonia*, though some additions and subtractions suggest themselves, e.g. Σ Ar. Eq. 198 is irrelevant at A α 53, because it does not mention the orthographical point which is the subject of Ael.'s gloss; but Suid. ε 2507 is relevant at A ε 57, Σ Ar. *Eccl.* 743¹ at A θ 3, and Σ Ar. Eq. 289 at A ν 15. Occasionally Erbse withholds important information; at A α 181 and γ 3 Adler's attributions are only conjectural, and at the former place Suidas names his authority as Διονύσιος (cf. schol. A at O 705); at P β 11 Eust. should be quoted in full.

A few points of detail are selected for comment.

pr. 9 f. In discussing Eust.'s use of φησί Erbse tends to formulate special laws for passages where the subject is clear from simple considerations of grammar and context; for instance, at Eust. 905. 14 (P π 36) the subject of φησί is plainly Πανσάβας. There are, however, many passages where φησί or λέγει is used with no subject expressed and where none can be understood (e.g. the sources of P α 127, α 169, π 14); it would have made the discussion more valuable if he had concentrated his attention on such passages and considered them all together.

pr. 37 n. 3. If Eust. does not mean that βασιλειᾶν = βασιλείας ἀντιποιεῖσθαι, then βασιλειᾶν is the only word in his list of derivatives of βασιλεύς left unexplained, which seems improbable.

pr. 54-55. To the list of proverbs common to Paus. and the Plato-scholia add γ 11 = Σ *Phileb.* 48 c, λ 19 = Σ *Euthd.* 298 c, π 5 = Σ [Pl.] *Sisyph.* 389 c.

pr. 67-68. Erbse seems to underestimate the Atticist element in the Aristophanes-scholia (cf. W. G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Greek Annotation*, ch. 3). In referring to Aristophanes-scholia he sometimes fails to distinguish old scholia from later interpolations, e.g. pr. 46 n. 4 (Σ *Nub.* 133), pr. 48 n. 2 (Σ *Eq.* 580). Dübner's brackets are misinterpreted on p. 68, nn. 2 and 3.

A α 52 and pr. 53 sect. III (b). Possibly Ael. is explaining Theocr. i. 47; cf. schol. (c) ad loc.

A δ 2. 'expectares τοῦ Ζεὺς.' The practice of grammarians varies in this matter; cf. the passages quoted by J. W. White at Σ Ar. *Av.* 26.

A ε 55. Perhaps ῥάπισμα should be transposed to follow γνάθου, keeping λαμβάνειν.

A ψ 4 and pr. 14 f. Erbse's treatment of this fragment is incompatible with his adoption of Dobree's οἶον, which can only introduce καὶ ῥύπον as an explanatory gloss on καὶ ψόθου. The γε καὶ ψόθου may be a mutilated fragment of a line from Aeschylus. Erbse might also have adopted Dobree's ἀποκομματικὸν λεγέειδον.

P ε 83. Schwabe fr. 216 is merely a note on ἰχθύκεντρον from Eust. 811. 42 and has nothing to do with Εὐρυβάτης πονηρός.

The standard of mechanical accuracy is remarkably high, and the indexes are excellent both in quality and in quantity. There are a very few false

¹ The scholion clearly refers to θάλλους; the lemma is merely a line-reference.

references, e.g. pr. 32 sect. 4 for *Ba.* 420. 21 read *Ba.* 410. 21, and a small number of misprints and slips, e.g. pr. 8 n. 1 the quotation from Lobeck should read [ἐπειτεν ix. 83. 89] (he was probably referring to ix. 84 init.), at A η 2 read οὐν τῷ ἰ γράφεται, in the notes on P α 89 'Co.' has been misplaced and has extruded 'Poll.'

The 'epimetrum', 'de Athenaei codice Eustathiano' provides much valuable material for the student of Athenaeus and gives interesting, but scarcely convincing, reasons for rejecting Maas's theory that the epitomator used only the Marcianus (unmutilated) and his identification of the epitomator as Eustathius.

These studies will arouse eager expectations of more of Erbse's work on the Homer-scholia, of which they are apparently a by-product.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

THE TEUBNER CAESAR

C. Iuli Caesaris *Commentarii*. Edidit ALFREDUS KLOTZ. Vol. II. *Commentarii Belli Civilis*. Editio altera. Pp. xxii + 170. Leipzig: Teubner, 1950. Cloth and boards, \$2.35.

IN stating (*Philologus*, Suppl. Band xxxi, Heft 2, 1938, pp. 132-71) the case for believing that Caesar himself published the *Bellum Civile* soon after the events there recorded, C. Barwick was largely concerned with destroying the arguments of Professor Klotz (*Rhein. Mus.* lxvi, 1911, pp. 81-93 and preface to 1926 Teubner edition) in support of the view that the work is unfinished. The reprinting of the Teubner text affords Klotz an opportunity for answering some of Barwick's objections and for modifying slightly his own position.

Klotz now admits (praef. xiv) that he was wrong in believing certain passages to contain 'doublets' (iii. 9. 7, 48. 1, and, as it appears from his text, 71. 3). Neither these passages nor some of those earlier regarded by Klotz as ill-fitting insertions intolerable in a finished work (i. 12-13; iii. 94. 3-4, 96. 1-2, 100-1) are now marked as unfinished.

But in spite of these concessions to his opponent, Klotz can still produce strong arguments for incompleteness: (a) i. 56-58 and ii. 35. 1-2 break the flow of the narrative and, as Barwick admits in the case of the former, are not properly 'dovetailed' into their context. (b) i. 7. 6 and ii. 29. 3-4 suggest rough drafts of speeches rather than finished versions, however much the latter may be supposed to have suffered in transmission. (c) Contradictions occur (i. 7. 8 and 8. 1 reading *evocat et*, ii. 32. 5 and 37. 2) such as Caesar would have removed in a finished work, however hastily published. Such arguments as these, together with that drawn from the abrupt ending of the *Bellum Civile*, which Barwick does not satisfactorily explain, seem conclusive evidence that the work was not published by Caesar himself.

The further argument that certain passages where the text breaks off abruptly (iii. 8, 10, 50) are also evidence of Caesar's failure to complete the work is unconvincing. We may believe that in the course of composition Caesar would leave some passages in draft form and others roughly inserted, but is it likely that any historian, least of all one who wrote with such ease and speed as Caesar (Hirt. *B.G.* viii, praef. 6), would break off in the middle of a sentence and leave the narrative incomplete? In spite of Barwick's objections (op. cit.,

p. 158), Klotz still tries to draw an illegitimate parallel between these passages and Virgil's half-lines (praef. xiv).

In establishing the text, Klotz has benefited by the suggestions of Fabre (whose collation of the Neapolitanus he has used) and of Castiglioni and other modern scholars. Faced by the enormous amount of emendation and conjecture which the *Bellum Civile* has called forth, he is wisely conservative—much more so than in his previous edition. In some cases, as he explains in his preface (xv–xix), he prefers now to retain a manuscript reading as an example of the *sermo vulgaris* or *sermo castrensis*. But this explanation must be used with caution. For instance, i. 6. 4, the double negative *non passurum negat* without *se* is dubious in Caesar, though neither pleonasm nor ellipse would be objectionable in the Comic poets: Fabre's *se passurum negat* is preferable. iii. 76. 1, it is better to read *veteribus suis in castris* with W, p, V, and similarly i. 67. 2, in *Caesaris castris* (a C. castris σ, C. castris β). Klotz is probably right, however, in retaining *solvantur* in iii. 20. 5, and the use of *recipere* without *se*, common no doubt in military language (cf. *B. Afr.* 9. 2, 18. 2; *Vell.* ii. 70. 1), is wisely admitted in iii. 46. 6 and 97. 2.

Other changes from the 1926 edition which are clearly improvements include: i. 32. 7 *hortatur ac postulat*, 57. 4 *Domiti spe* (*indomiti spe* codd.), ii. 14. 6 *ut superioris temporis contentionem* (codd.), iii. 32. 6 *ut ii sortem fecerant* (Constans), 60. 5 *id difficultus*, and 70. 2 *prope iam expeditam*.

The following passages are still unsatisfactory: i. 64. 6: the words *excipiuntur ac sublevantur* clearly relate to the danger of the men themselves being washed away, and we need a reference to this in the text. We should therefore read *pauci ex his militibus vi fluminis abrepti* (Oudendorp) and suppose that *arma* arose from a correction of the prefix of *abrepti*. i. 83. 3: Fabre's reading, quoted in the *apparatus*, is preferable: *Caesar nisi coactus proelium ne committeret*. iii. 2. 3: Schiller, followed by Barwick (op. cit., p. 160), rightly believed that there is a lacuna before *atque eae*, that *eae* refers to the legions mentioned in iii. 6. 2 and also in the lost passage, and that *copiae* has been added and inserted in the text in two different places. iii. 101. 4: Castiglioni's suggestion (*Gnomon*, iv, 1928, p. 685) *adplicatisque nostris ad terram navibus . . . pari atque antea ratione egerat Cassius . . . naves . . . inmisit* gives satisfactory sense with the minimum of change.

There are a few misprints: in the preface, p. xvii, last line, read *tenebantur*; in the text, p. 24, l. 28 *ipsius loci opportunitatem*; p. 55, l. 19 *ex portu*; p. 136, l. 14 *facultatibus*; p. 138, l. 5 *erant*; p. 151, l. 3 *diutissime*; in the *apparatus* to p. 109, l. 14 *illi om.* σ, to p. 114, l. 8 *quam quae* Kraff., to p. 125, l. 14 *quibus* σ; and in the Index under *Pompeiani* delete 62. 2, and for *C. Iulius Caesar adulescens* read *L. Iulius Caesar adulescens*.

University of St. Andrews

J. H. SIMON

CICERO'S LETTERS IN THE BUDÉ SERIES

Cicéron: *Correspondance*, Tome IV. Texte établi et traduit par L. A. CONSTANS et JEAN BAYET. Pp. 260. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.

THE third volume of this edition was reviewed in 1937 (*C.R.* li. 134). After all these years it is pleasant to welcome the fourth volume, which follows the plan

of its predecessors. We mourn, alas, the death of the brilliant scholar, L. A. Constans, who edited the first three volumes. Though one could not always agree with his restorations of doubtful passages in the text, the keenness of his mind and the persuasive charm of his writings brought a liveliness into his work that will be sadly missed. Happily, if this fourth volume can be taken as substantial enough to allow us to form a judgement, we can count ourselves fortunate that the continuation of Constans's work has been entrusted to the capable hands of J. Bayet. The seventy-four letters in this volume, dating from August 51 to October 50, all deal with Cicero's governorship of Cilicia. Constans is responsible for about one-third of the book and Bayet for the rest.

Among the numerous novelties introduced by Constans to the text in the first section of this book are some neat suggestions, e.g. *Fam.* ii. 7. 4 *quaest.* (i.e. *quaestorio*) a *senatore* for *quasi a senatore*. Others involve more widespread alterations, as at *Fam.* viii. 8. 3, where his reading, though palaeographically satisfactory, cannot be said to be certain owing to the doubtful facts of the case. At *Fam.* viii. 8. 10, where Wesenberg's *dari* is read, the reader should be told that the manuscripts have *dare*. On the other hand, Constans vindicates the manuscript reading on occasion, as at *Fam.* viii. 8. 5 *i. u.* (= *ita uniuerſi*); *Fam.* iii. 8. 6 *committerem* (for the vulgate *committere*), which, if right, must be due to the proximity of so many other imperfect subjunctives; and *Att.* v. 20. 7, where *est* of most manuscripts is rightly kept as against *sit* of m A² c Rom.

Bayet also contributes his share of emendations, of which it may be said that none is impossible, none absolutely certain, all are judicious; e.g. *Att.* v. 21. 6, *sed* (<et>) has something to be said for it, while *Att.* vi. 1. 23, *bene mehercule* (<e>pot<a>uit *Luceius Tusculanum*, if not certain, at least deserves to be right. But Bayet's strength lies in the interpretation of the text as it stands, with alteration, if any, only of the punctuation: e.g. *Att.* vi. 1. 3 *sed dico . . . me reuocauī . . .* 'but I tell you . . . well, I won't say what I was going to say . . .' His explanations of *mysteria*, *Att.* v. 21. 14; *ſenus et impendium*, *Att.* vi. 1. 4; *nos nihil frigore frigescimus*, *Fam.* viii. 6, 4, 'it isn't the cold that keeps us cold' (most editors delete *nihil*), are attractive and probably correct.

Others who have contributed to the text are Romain (*Att.* v. 21. 1, *nunc spero*; though Madvig's *uno: spero* is perhaps preferable) and Durand at *Att.* vi. 2. 7 and *Fam.* viii. 14. 2.

On p. 218, line 9, read *hoc* for *hic*.

It is beyond the competence of the present reviewer to criticize the translation, and he will content himself by saying that he has read the greater part of it with considerable pleasure, and that it seems to flow easily and to be clear and natural. Beyond a few places where he has doubts whether the French really closely represents the Latin, he has noted only one or two slips; e.g. *Fam.* viii. 9. 3 *multis partibus plures* is 'many times more', not merely 'un beau-coup plus grand nombre'; *Fam.* ii. 17. 4 CCCXXX is 100,000, not 3,000. Such details apart, the translation seems careful and trustworthy.

The introductory notices to each section are a feature of this edition, and here the reader will find not only a clear résumé of the period covered by each particular section of letters, along with an appraisal of Cicero's own feelings and attitude, but closely argued reasons for the dates now assigned to doubtful letters. There is no doubt that the letters appear here in a truer chronological order than ever before.

Philomelium, Amanus, Cyrrhestica are among the names that do not appear on the otherwise serviceable folding map at the end of the volume, which is to be recommended as a very worthy and welcome addition to the Budé series.

University of Leeds

E. J. WOOD

THE TEXT OF THE *GERMANIA*

J. PERRET: *Recherches sur le texte de la 'Germanie'*. Pp. viii + 166. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.

THIS volume, which is the outcome of M. Perret's labours in preparing a critical text for his Budé edition of the *Germania* (1949), is to be welcomed as the first detailed study of the manuscript tradition since the late R. P. Robinson in 1935 produced a critical edition that was based, for the first time, on all the then known manuscripts. Perret agrees with Robinson in recognizing five main families of manuscripts (X, α , β , ϕ , s), but proposes a number of modifications, two of which are of some substance: (i) our manuscripts do not descend from the ninth-century codex *Hersfeldensis* (Hf) but from a single fifteenth-century copy of it; (ii) α , β , ϕ , s are not grandchildren of the archetype via an apograph Y, but, equally with X, are direct descendants of the archetype.

Robinson (pp. 93-101) lists thirty cases where X divides against Y, but only five of these, according to Perret, merit consideration. Perret accepts, as giving the readings of the archetype, three of these (39. 1 *vetustissimos seu*, 36. 3 *tracti*, 40. 1 *nobilitat*) and rejects two (28. 2 *signatque*, 30. 2 *animis*). The number is not large enough to justify Robinson's contention that X makes a substantial contribution to the restoration of the archetype that is not found in the other manuscripts. X should be regarded as having a rank equal to each of the other four families, not to all four combined.

In chapter 2 Perret lists and analyses 80 doublets which he believes to derive from the archetype (cf. Robinson p. 137 footnote 1, where 73 doublets are mentioned: they agree in about 50 cases): this list provides the evidence on which much of the argumentation of the rest of the book is based.

Perret supports the view that the manuscripts of the minor works of Tacitus passed through a stage where the lines had about thirteen letters each and offers fourteen examples (not all equally convincing), drawn from the *Germania* and the *Agricola*, where omissions, insertions, or transpositions involving multiples of thirteen letters occur. He rejects the view that all the marginal and interlinear corrections in Hf are conjectural.

The general reader will find most interest in the last chapter, where Perret proceeds to the identification of the archetype. Hf was in Rome in 1455 (Decembrio's testimony); a reconstruction of the archetype shows that it was, if not Hf itself, a direct descendant of Hf. Among the reasons for believing that the archetype was distinct from Hf are: (i) W and V (belonging to two distinct families) preserve an almost identical paragraphing that is radically different from the paragraphing of Hf; (ii) the association of *Germania*, *Dialogus*, Suetonius' *de Grammaticis* in X is best explained on the assumption that these three works were copied from Hf *before* it was dismembered (*Agricola* was not copied because it did not interest the person for whom the transcript was

made): this copy became the archetype of our manuscripts; (iii) the archetype had *inscitia* (16. 2); Hf had *inscientia* (Decembrio's testimony): unless Decembrio's note is erroneous, Hf cannot be the archetype.

The natural inference that the archetype was copied from Hf in the fifteenth century (presumably between 1455 and 1460) is supported by some ambiguities in the script, e.g. *inopiae/innoxiae* (38. 4) arising from confusion between cursive *x* and *p*, *romane/ratione* (30. 2) from *ro^e* or *rone*, *Marcoque/Marco quoque/mi quoque* (37. 5) from *m^q*.

Perret seeks to restore to Enoch of Ascoli the honour of bringing or sending Hf to Rome. The fact that in 1455-7 Hf was not in his hands is no proof that he had not already sent it to the Vatican: Poggio's jealousy may have inspired his remarks about Enoch's incompetence. Once Hf had reached Rome, our manuscript tradition centres round Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II). He it is who in a letter of 1458 (to Martin Mayer, chancellor of the Bishop of Mainz) first shows a knowledge of the contents of the *Germania* (though not, apparently, of its actual wording), and manuscripts of each of the five main families have associations with him or his writings. The contents of the archetype (*Germania*, *Dialogus*, Suetonius) correspond exactly to his known interests. Moreover, four sections in which the archetype of the *Germania* had paragraphs of a brevity unparalleled in Hf contain the exact arguments that Aeneas uses in his letter to Mayer. It is tempting to believe that it was for Aeneas Sylvius that the archetype was executed about 1458.

If the archetype was written in the fifteenth century, there is no longer any palaeographical objection to emendations such as *praecingitur* (for *peragitur* 42. 1), but, in general, the conclusions to be drawn from Perret's *Recherches* are negative; as the gulf between archetype and Tacitus is wider, more must depend on the editor's own judgement; that, rather than the consensus of particular manuscripts, will determine when he is to depart from the reading of the archetype and which of its variants he is to accept.

University of Leeds

R. H. MARTIN

THE TEXT OF JUVENCUS

NILS HANSSON: *Textkritisches zu Juvenecus*. Mit vollständigem Index Verborum. Pp. 169. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. Paper, Kr. 10.

In these critical notes Mr. Hansson begins with a review of the editions and special studies of Juvenecus up to the present time. He blames Marold for too small a critical apparatus in his Teubner edition of 1886, Huemer (*C.S.E.L.*, 1891) for too slavish a reliance on Marold and for failing to give a proper view of the textual tradition, Kievits and De Wits (1940, 1947) for ignoring serious problems or for lack of thoroughness in handling them. Hansson himself lists over thirty manuscripts of the eighth to the twelfth centuries, and, after a discussion of them and a list of variants, establishes a *stemma*. These manuscripts he proceeds to apply to the consideration of selected passages, first to those, twenty-seven in number, where there has been misreading or misunderstanding of the text, each passage being preceded by the text of the particular Evangelist that is being versified. He displays a very thorough knowledge of the poet's diction, metrical practice, and method of

reproducing the Bible text; e.g. he is probably right, in view of similar metrical liberties, in reading *reviuescere* with shortened second syllable in ii. 203 rather than emendations or variant readings such as *revirescere* or *reuigescere*, and certainly right in adopting Badius's conjecture *peregrinanti* for *peregrina mihi* in iv. 290.

More important, however, is his treatment of what he calls the *doppelfassungen*, cases where a choice has to be made between alternative lines, sometimes two or even three in succession; of these one (line or couplet) must be either interpolated or (as Hansson himself holds, though of course not in every case) go back to the author himself. These cases are very numerous, and, while most of them appear in the oldest manuscript (C), they are spread over a considerable number of manuscripts, as he shows in a table. If, as both Hansson and Huemer agree, the redundant lines were in the archetype (fifth or sixth century), how did they get there? It is possible to hold that there must be interpolation in every case. This is the view of Korn (1870), whose arguments, if they may be so called, Hansson quotes; Korn will not admit that Juvenecus left his work in so unfinished a state as to contain alternative lines and couplets concerning which he had not finally decided, and requires independent evidence of his having done so; further, assuming interpolation, he appears to decide which is genuine by the number of manuscripts in which the variants occur. It is, of course, impossible to prove that Juvenecus left behind him alternative versions, but Hansson, assuming the possibility of there having been either a second, revised edition or a posthumous edition based on a manuscript of the author containing variants, considers the doublets from that point of view. The situation is, in fact, that which we find in three passages of Statius' *Thebaid*, iv. 555, x. 135, xi. 490, and perhaps in Horace, *Sat.* i. 6. 126; Hansson would seem to be justified in his assumption, but there is a danger, that of yielding to the inclination to explain any variant in this way; his method is to take first thirteen passages which provide conspicuous examples of redundant lines or couplets; in all these cases he tests the variants to see whether they are inconsistent with Juvenecus' style and general practice, and, if not, whether they can be explained as first or second formulations of the required phrase. Obviously this is a difficult matter, but it is the first time that a systematic and thorough examination of the question has been attempted; syntax, word-formation, metrical practice, as well as possible motives for interpolation, have to be considered; there is bound to be a subjective element in the final decision, as in the description of the storm in ii. 27-32. On the whole the critic's judgement seems sound enough.

The thirteen passages above-mentioned are followed by some others, in which Hansson feels that the situation does not admit of argument, and by a third section where the variants are of single words, not lines. As might be expected here, it is harder to be sure that both variants go back to Juvenecus himself, and in fact only a quarter of those considered are thought by Hansson to do so. Of these, the case of ii. 11, *ueliolum/multisonum*, is perhaps as good an example as any.

The last section consists of a complete glossary of all the words used by Juvenecus, inclusive of variants, and with the bare reference to place of occurrence, more complete than Huemer's, which lacks (e.g.) *abundo*, *accido*, *castellum*, *effrenus*, and others, but containing only *Verba* and not *Locutiones*.

Queen Mary College, London

J. H. MOZLEY

THE INSTITUTES OF GAIUS

Gaius: *Institutes*. Texte établi et traduit par JULIEN REINACH. Pp. xix + 379. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Paper.

THE task of an editor of Gaius is to some extent peculiar: he has, of course, apart from the recent Egyptian fragments, only one manuscript; moreover, for all practical purposes he must rely not on the manuscript, but on Studemund's *Apographum*, the readings of which are often uncertain. The text is full of errors, repetitions, and omissions (which Studemund suggested were an indication 'minus olei nonnumquam quam vini a semisomnis librariis consumptum esse'), and the many abbreviations are inconsistently used. His main task, therefore, is to determine which are the errors and omissions, and how far they may justifiably be rectified by conjecture or with the necessarily suspect assistance of Justinian's *Institutes*, the few excerpts in the *Digest*, and a solitary, though important, passage in the *Collatio*, together with any hints to be derived from Theophilus and elsewhere. As to which are the errors and omissions there has developed in 130 years of editing a wide *communis opinio*, and there is also a fair measure of agreement as to the substance and often the form of the corrections; this agreement was fortified by the evidence of the Egyptian fragments.

In his approach to this task M. Reinach, a *Conseiller d'État*, has been very much more conservative than any recent editor. He has, he explains in the Introduction, rectified obvious spelling mistakes and 'barbarismes et non-sens grossiers', but has been more discreet in correcting solecisms, even when they conflict with classical grammatical rules, and in allowing supplements and suppressions. With the omission of major supplements there can be no quarrel, but it may well be thought that he has been over-discreet in his attitude to solecisms and intrusive words. To reproduce the odd and often impossible Latin of an admittedly unreliable manuscript without any indication in the *apparatus* of widely or universally accepted corrections seems to serve no purpose except that of driving the reader to another edition. The reader's difficulties are increased by the practice, unobjectionable in itself, of indicating only some of the departures from the manuscript by italics.

Discordant tenses are too many to be worth illustrating, but of other 'solecisms' a few may be taken as examples. iii. 146 *idque ex accidentibus apparet, tanquam sub condicione facta cuiusque uenditionem an locationem* (usual correction: *uenditione . . . locatione*; sometimes also *aut*). iii. 206 *necesse se habent custodiam praestare*, where *se* is always omitted, with the support, if needed, of Justinian. iv. 53 *d alterutrum eorum ex his* cannot all be right. In ii. 151 the translation assumes a (necessary) correction of *minus* to *minus non* or *magis*. In iv. 187 the translation assumes the (equally necessary) deletion of a *non*. In all these cases the *apparatus* is silent. The list could be greatly extended.

Reinach also offers many of his own corrections, usually in a proper endeavour to keep more closely to the manuscript. Among the more important are: ii. 66 *persecuti erimus*, which is nearer than Goeschen's *adquisierimus*, but 'poursuivre par l'occupation' is rather odd sense. He transposes the last two sentences of iii. 156, thus dispensing with the usual moving of *sed* and preserving *consentientis*; this, however, involves making *consentientis* mean 'qui tient pour l'affirmative' in the dispute. In i. 111 he reads *domum* (*usum* edd.) *cuiusque anni interrumpet*, but again it is difficult to make this mean 'interrompre le domicile chaque

année'; similarly iv. 13: *periculosa . . . falsi sacramenti* ('risquée quant à l'enjeu en cas de mensonge'). In iv. 141 (from the only non-palimpsest page of the manuscript, of which Studemund gives a photograph) Studemund reads *edictum*, the *e* being at the end of the line and not certainly legible in the photograph. Reinach argues that this letter is not *e* but a crossed *i*, which is a common abbreviation in the manuscript for *inter*, and he therefore makes a similar correction in iv. 165 and 166. This is an ingenious suggestion, though, as he says, Cic. *pro Caec.* 45 is against it, and Studemund's *e* is not as impossible as he maintains.

In a text which preserves solecisms without comment it is doubly unfortunate that, in spite of a lengthy errata sheet, there should be many misprints. The most important are: ii. 79 *et* for *ut*; iii. 90 and iv. 18 *proprio* (*proprie*); iii. 103 *ualet* (*ualeat*); iv. 23 *par* (*per*), 79 *doctores* (*auctores*). There are some also in the *apparatus* and translation.

The translation is slightly awkward and occasionally mistaken. Two examples must suffice: iii. 111 'peut se faire payer' (*ei recte soluitur*); iii. 215 'a reçu' (*acceptam fecerit*). There are some innovations, the most important of which is that Reinach gives to *libra* in the mancipatory ceremony its primary meaning. Thus, *hoc aere aeneaque libra* is 'par ce bronze et par cette livre de bronze'. This avoids giving the word two meanings in the same sentence in iii. 174, but the secondary meaning is well attested and makes better sense of the ceremony.

Brasenose College, Oxford

BARRY NICHOLAS

GREEK SYNTAX

Griechische Grammatik, auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik, von EDUARD SCHWYZER. Zweiter Band: *Syntax und Syntaktische Stilistik*. Vervollständigt und herausgegeben von ALBERT DEBRUNNER. Pp. xxiv + 714. Munich: Beck, 1950. Paper, DM. 48; Cloth, DM. 54.

THE late Eduard Schwyzler undertook the work of rewriting Brugmann and Thumb's Greek Grammar in I. von Müller's *Handbuch* as far back as 1921. For some years he had much other work on his hands, including strenuous participation in the compilation of the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon*. (Happy the land whose Schwyzers and von Plantas busy themselves with *Idiotika* and *Dicziunaris* *è* *παράργη*!) Emigration to Germany in 1927 brought him more free time, and before his death in May 1943 he had not only published the first volume of the new Grammar but had written out the bulk of the second volume, covering Syntax. His manuscripts, however, contained masses of additional references pencilled in on the margin: his editor has incorporated in the text as many of these as he felt he could make room for, besides himself filling up the many small, and the few large, gaps left in it by the author. An Index volume (to the whole work) was to have been issued in the early summer of 1950, but has not yet ('summer' 1952) come to hand: one can only hope that the *iniquitas temporum* will not delay its appearance very much longer.

This syntax has been written primarily for *Alphilologen* by one who was primarily a *Sprachwissenschaftler*—an arrangement with which, at the present

stag
with
from
lang
illus
histo
afra
quo
My
that
'mel
etc.
spac
Gree
press
its p
whos
make
brun
unha
Bo
reprim
appe
nāvro
'them
Burus
place
Bloros
Gen.
Othell
Gramm
iii. 82
right,
Contr
sweeth
ἀλέσας
weal.
Herod
overlo
αὐτήν
Non-d
picture
see Ed
Has it
What
P. 297
Soph.
Infiniti
κατανε
avoidin

stage of Greek studies, few will be disposed to quarrel. It is chiefly concerned with the classical language and far the greater part of the examples is drawn from the classical authors, though some of the later developments of the living language—even down to the present day—are also dealt with briefly and illustrated from literary and other sources. Its primary aim is to explain the historical development of Greek syntax (p. 17) and the editor seems a little afraid (pp. v f.) that readers may take umbrage at the great number of examples quoted. I hope and believe that he has no cause for apprehension on that score. My own wish is that the abbreviations had been much more abbreviated, so that we might have had many more examples, fewer occurrences of the refrain 'mehr bei Kühner-Gerth', and, at times, more discrimination of similar uses, etc. When I have said that and added that, to my thinking, relatively too much space is devoted to Cases and Prepositions and too little to that kingpin of the Greek language, $\delta\ \eta\ \tau\acute{o}$, and the syntax of the Complex Sentence, I have expressed the only general criticisms I have to offer. The book will no doubt take its place forthwith as the standard Greek Syntax, even although those of us whose mother, or, it may be, stepmother tongue is English will continue to make use also of Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* (known to Schwyzler and Debrunner only in the 1889 edition and apparently not used by them) and the unhappily inchoate *Syntax of Classical Greek*.

Books of this kind do not quickly go into second editions, but in case of a reprint having room for some *Nachträge*, I subjoin here a number of what appear to me *corrigenda* ($\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\tau\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon$, $\chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\pi\acute{o}\nu\ \delta'\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\omega\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$) and, at the worst, harmless *addenda*. P. 43. Collective Plurals: Cf. 'they', 'them', of porridge, soup, pudding, etc., in Scots; also D. L. R. Lorimer, *The Burushaski Language* (Oslo, 1935), i. 45. P. 66. 2. Nomin. Absol.: Is this the place for Dem. iv. 28 $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{o}\iota\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon$? P. 122. Eur. *Bacch.* 389 $\delta\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \eta\sigma\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ here illustrates the Gen. of Quality, but on p. 129 it illustrates the Gen. of Material. P. 149, n. 1. Ethic Dative: To the alloglossic parallels add *Othello*, i. 1 'Whip me such honest knaves', and cf. Abbott, *Shakespearean Grammar*, § 220. P. 170. Doppelter Dative: Rather, multiple Dative; cf. Thuc. iii. 82. 1 (triple dative). P. 181. Proleptic Adj.: Though it is customary, is it right, to speak of prolepsis in cases like *Agam.* 1247 $\epsilon\upsilon\phi\eta\mu\omicron\nu\ \dots\ \kappa\omicron\iota\mu\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\ \sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha$? Contrast 'she shot her sweetheart dead' on the one hand with 'she kissed her sweetheart dead', and on the other with Eur. *Med.* 435 $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omicron\nu\ \kappa\omicron\iota\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\nu$, and *Macbeth*, iii. iv. 76, 'Ere humane statute purged the gentle weal.' Pp. 186 ff. Reflexive Pronouns. J. E. Powell's articles on the reflexive in Herodotus and Thucydides in *C.Q.* xxvii and xxviii have unfortunately been overlooked. P. 187. *Αὐτός* with Pers. Pron.: Add Plato, *Crat.* 439 a-b $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$ (*bis*). P. 189. Genitival Dat. of Pron.: Add Thuc. i. 6. 3 ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$). P. 224. Non-deponent Middles are said to be found in Latin *ganz selten*. If Plautus' picture of *das Ewig-Weibliche* at work (*Poen.* 219 f.) is not sufficient disproof, see Edith Clafstin in *A.J.P.* lxxii. 194-221. P. 261, n. 1. Metaplotischer Aorist: Has it really been shown that the 'Ingressive' Aorist is never merely ingressive? What of $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$, etc., in Herod. ii. 174. 2; iv. 160. 1; Thuc. ii. 97. 3? P. 297. Imperfect Participle: The pcpp. in *Od.* viii. 491, Aesch. *Pers.* 266, Soph. *Ant.* 1192, *O.C.* 1587, are not, as is implied, in *O.O.* P. 366. Nomin. Infinitive: What is said leaves me in doubt whether, for example, anarthrous $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\eta\gamma\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ in Plato, *Rep.* 493 c is regular or is an irregularity committed in avoiding an unparalleled juxtaposition of four articles ($\delta\ \tau\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu$). P. 392,

n. 6. *Τυγχάνω* = *τυγχάνω ὦν*. There seems to be a case for discriminating here between Attic Prose and other literature. If my count is right, in Thucydides and the X Orators there are 105 examples of *τυγχάνω ὦν* and only 6 of *τυγχάνω* = *τυγχάνω ὦν*, whereof 4 are readily susceptible of emendation. (In *Ar. Eccl.* 1141, of which Porson's emendation is unsatisfactory, as it lessens the parallelism with 1142, the absence of *ὦν* may be *metri gratia*, like *-οιοι*, *-αισι*, frequent elsewhere.) P. 404. A.U.C. Construction: This is found with an adjective, as so often in Latin, in Aesch. *Pers.* 905 (*θεότρεπτα τάδ'*). P. 405. Omission of *ὦν*: Whether or not *ὦν* is ever omitted in the acc. abs. construction I do not know, but if it is, it can hardly be 'zur Vermeidung des Gleichklangs -ον ὦν'. Why should Thucydides have jibbed at writing *ὡς καλὸν ὦν* in ii. 35. 1, when elsewhere he has *ἀδύνατον ὦν* three times, and, within the limits of a single chapter (i. 2), *ἄδελον ὦν* and *βέβαιον ὦν*? This is again a case where statistics would help one to a judgement. To the few cases of omitted *ὦν*, how many are there of -ον ὦν? And in how many passages is the manuscript tradition divided on the matter (as in Plato, *Apol.* 38 a, *Phaedr.* 230 a, *Theaet.* 151 c)? P. 406. Pcp. dependent on Pcp.: In *Soph. Phil.* 410 f. is not *παρὼν* dependent on *ἤνειχετο* rather than on *ὀρών*? In any case Plato, *Gorg.* 471 b piles on the participial agony much more convincingly. P. 422. 2. Compound Verb and Simple Verb: The principle in question seems to have a long-range action in Dem. xviii. 25 (*ἀποπλεῖν*) and 27 (*πλεῖν*). For a somewhat similar principle in Shakespeare cf. Abbott, *Shakesp. Gram.*, § 475. P. 427 in. Position of Preposition: Add Thuc. iii. 14. 1 *ἐν οὗ τῷ ἱερῷ*. P. 458. Temporal *ἐν*: Note that it is especially used of the time it takes to do a thing, e.g. Plato, *Phaedo* 58 b. P. 493, n. 5. *Παρά* c. Dat. Rei: This is found also in Thucydides (e.g. ii. 43. 2; v. 26. 5). P. 504. *Περί* c. Acc.: In Plato, *Gorg.* 490 c Burnet was very likely right in punctuating *περί οὐρία*, *λέγεις* ('you mean'), *καὶ ποτά*. P. 551. *Μεταξύ*: The idiomatic elliptical use of *μεταξύ*, whereby the nearer limit is taken for granted and only the remoter limit is mentioned, seems to have been missed. It is seen in Dem. xviii. 26 here quoted. Cf. Scots 'atween an' lowsins' time'. P. 598 *οὐδεὶς οὐ*: This bulks, or bulked, much more largely in school teaching than in Greek authors, from whom only two examples are cited. Of these Xen. *Symp.* i. 9 (*οὐδεὶς οὐκ ἔπασχε τι*) is open to textual doubt. While Athenaeus' *οὐδεὶς ἦν δὲ οὐκ* looks like a would-be correction of the vulgate, *δοῖς* could easily have fallen out after *οὐδεὶς*. Nothing is said here or in the next section about a simple non-pleonastic (non-repetitive) *οὐ* following another simple *οὐ*, as in Thuc. vi. 33. 1 and Lys. vi. 34. P. 604. Position of Common Attribute. It seems to be implied, wrongly, that the order *ac + b(c)* [*conjunctio*] is not very common, and the order *(c)a + cb* not very rare, in Attic prose. P. 626. Exclamatory Use of Interrogations: While this use (i.e. for classical Greek) is denied by Kühner-Gerth ii, p. 439 Schwyzer-Debrunner find it already in the Homeric *ποῖον ἔπος*, etc., as well as in Eur. *El.* 570, Xen. *An.* vi. 5. 19 f., and Dem. i. 24. The subject is too complicated to deal with here, but I may point out some other passages which any discussion of it would have to take into account: Eur. *Supp.* 769, Dem. vi. 20, viii. 63, Eubul. 115, 1 K., Philem. 2. 1 K., Theoc. 23. 5. P. 659. *Ἐπειδὴ* = 'when'. This is found not only with the impf., but also with the aorist, cf. Lys. vii. 5. Pp. 670 f. *Ὅπως*: The treatment is unduly compressed. No notice is taken of Dawes's Canon and its later modifications, and the inquirer will be left puzzled whether, for example, *βοηθήσητε* must be rejected in Dem. i. 2, and, if so, what we are to say about *I.G.* ii. 115. 40 ff. Pp. 687 f. *Εἰ* and *ἐάν* in Interrogative

Clauses: No distinction is made between *εἰ* and *ἐάν* in this connexion. So also Kühner-Gerth, ii, p. 533; but, in spite of passages like And. i. 37 and Dem. xix. 19, it is difficult not to feel some sympathy with the denials or hesitations of Goodwin (*M.T.*, §§ 493, 680), Stahl (*S.G.V.*, p. 380), and Smyth (*G.G.S.C.*, § 1552). (I am glad, by the way, to have found one translator—Lindskog—who realizes that this question is not involved in *Gorg.* 526 b.)

Pietas has aided scholarship in the work of seeing this book through the press. I have noted no false references and only a few misprints.

University of St. Andrews

W. L. LORIMER

TROY

CARL W. BLEGEN, with the collaboration of JOHN L. CASKEY, MARION RAWSON, and JEROME SPERLING: *Troy: General Introduction: the First and Second Settlements*. Vol. I. Part 1: Text. Pp. xxiv+396. Part 2: Plates. Pp. xxvii; 473 figs. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, 235s. net.

By all but a few flat-earthers the *tell* of Hissarlik has long been accepted as Homer's Troy: the days when *dilettanti* dogmatically dipped their thermometers in the hot and cold springs of Bunarbashi are gone along with those when Achaean veterans (more reliably) drew maps of Troy among the dessert with a finger wetted in the after-dinner wine. Schliemann in seven major campaigns, and Dörpfeld in two, between 1870 and 1895 removed well over half of the mound, and revealed nine successive 'cities' of Troy, of which the VIth was, they believed, the Homeric one, clearly the key stronghold of north-west Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. What then remained for later archaeologists? Would it not be *sero venientibus ossa*? But it is the chosen task of archaeologists to make the dry bones live.

While forty years passed over the grass-grown dumps of Schliemann's dig other archaeologists (ultimately prompted by his work) had revealed evidence of unimagined Bronze Age civilizations in all the Aegean area. Their new knowledge provoked new questions, largely concerned with the origins and inter-relation of Aegean and Anatolian cultures; and during the course of their work archaeology was serving its apprenticeship to science. Consequently the University of Cincinnati excavations in the Troad, begun on the initiative of Professor W. T. Semple, and carried on through seven successive campaigns from 1932 to 1938, had very different methods as well as different aims from those of their predecessors. They set out to re-examine the whole stratification of Troy, isolating undisturbed deposits of each age so as to give a complete sequence of material for the whole long period through which the site was inhabited, and as far as possible to elucidate its external relations and chronology. A second aim was to fill out the picture by the discovery, if possible, of pre-classical cemeteries belonging to the site; a third, to explore the whole Troad systematically for other early habitation sites. They knew that they were in for a long period of exacting research; but also that they were 'under no compulsion to recover objects of startling or sensational character with high publicity value'.

In some parts of the mound un-dug 'islands' had been left by the earlier

excavators, almost as though deliberately to afford their successors a means of checking their results. In others, especially on the north side, the lowest strata exposed by Schliemann had subsequently been buried under thousands of tons of dumped earth which the American expedition had laboriously to shift before real excavation could start. The task was huge; but it has been carried through with exemplary thoroughness of care and method. The results are to be published in four quarto volumes, each in two parts (text and plates), dealing in chronological order with the nine successive settlements. These are to be followed by an index volume, and supplemented by separate technical monographs on various sections of the material and on the exploration of the Troad.

This first volume covers Troy I and Troy II. The arrangement of the report will follow a constant pattern. The section on each settlement begins with an introductory outline, showing how far it was already explored, what new work has been done, its chronology and external relations. Then comes a careful classification of the finds—bone, stone, metal, and pottery; and finally a detailed description of the work in each area explored. All is amply illustrated by photographs, numerous plans and sections, and diagrams of classified shapes, profiles, decoration, etc., of pottery and of other objects. (The clarity and tone of the collotype reproductions are not always up to the high standard of the rest.) A gridded general plan makes it easy to relate details of work anywhere in the citadel to the rather complex whole.

The publication of a site has been likened to the critical edition of an ancient text; but when it involves such careful analysis and classification as here the analogy must be extended to the compilation of a lexicon as well. As such, parts of the work will only prove their full worth in prolonged use by archaeologists working on new finds from elsewhere; but there seems no risk that these parts will be found wanting in either clarity or completeness.

No neolithic stratum was discovered: Troy I is from the start familiar with the use of copper. The buildings (which include the earliest known example of a megaron-house) and the fortification walls discovered by the Cincinnati excavators show that even in this phase the citadel's rulers would have dominated north-west Asia Minor and the Straits. The pottery shows close similarity with that from layers I-V at Thermi in Lesbos, and a general relationship with Early Cycladic. From the middle phase of Troy I onwards there are imports of Early Cycladic and Early Helladic wares. Absolute dating is as yet impossible, but the settlement may begin about 3000 B.C.

The eight stages now distinguished in Troy II (against Dörpfeld's three) imply a much longer development than was previously supposed, though Schliemann and Dörpfeld had recovered much information about the walls and buildings of this period. It perished in a mighty fire 'long before the end of Early Cycladic and Early Helladic'; and it was the resultant 'burnt layer' (in which the famous gold treasures were probably found) that at first led Schliemann to equate this with Homer's Troy.

The report confines itself to describing the results of the Cincinnati excavations, without attempting to place in its classifications of material the objects recovered by Schliemann, since their stratification cannot now be determined with sufficient accuracy. To regret this restraint would, of course, be to misunderstand the nature of the publication, though one cannot but hope that Professor Blegen or at least one of his colleagues will one day produce an outline

acco
effec
and
bone
prese
diffic
draw
invol
prais
a ma
for a

Emma

BEN
McC
Ame

In th
by V
evid
resul
plex
thor
deve
to th
versy

Th
men
not s
the
conc

T
Mer
with
stan
subs
ships
and
ing
diffi
a fir
5,00
But
flow
appl
Leag
Th

account of Troy and its cultures, using the earlier finds as well. The report is in effect a magnificent object lesson in archaeological method, both of digging and publication. All possible material (including not only artefacts, but also bones, shells, etc., and earth samples for botanical and other analysis) has been preserved and recorded; and subsequent investigators will have the minimum difficulty in checking the excavators' conclusions, or (if they are so rash) in drawing their own. Professor Blegen and his whole team (for such a work involves highly organized collaboration over a long term) have merited high praise indeed for their lucid handling and presentation of so large and complex a mass of material. Congratulation is also due to the printers and publishers for an outstanding piece of book-production.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

F. H. STUBBINGS

ATHENIAN TRIBUTE LISTS

BENJAMIN DEAN MERITT, H. T. WADE-GERY, and MALCOLM FRANCIS MCGREGOR: *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Vol. III. Pp. xx+366. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1950. Cloth, \$10.

In this volume the study which began in a series of short penetrating articles by West and Meritt reaches its climax. In the first two volumes of *A.T.L.* the evidence was fully set out: now the historical conclusions are drawn. The result is exciting in style and content: in style, because even the most complex argument has been reduced to lucid form; in content, because the authors, having a unique command of the evidence, are always more interested in developing their own views than in refuting others, and prefer bold inferences to the safety of withholding judgement. There remains ample room for controversy, but no reader will complain that evidence has been concealed.

The book is divided into three parts. The first provides a further commentary on the quota and assessment lists. The second deals with problems not specifically related to tribute, but relevant to the more general history of the Empire. Part III is an historical narrative of the period, embodying the conclusions of the first two parts.

Two theses of major importance are now fully developed for the first time. Meritt had already suggested that the first assessment of 460 talents included with money payments the money equivalent of ships: this case is now substantiated. Aristides at Delos first assessed all the allies in terms of money; subsequently the Athenians at Athens decided which states should contribute ships. The actual money contributed at first was little more than 200 talents; and this went almost exclusively to reserve, since the ship contributors, including Athens, paid for their own contingents. This solution solves two serious difficulties. An assessment of less than 500 talents in 454 can be reconciled with a first assessment of 460 talents, so interpreted. The transfer of as much as 5,000 talents from Delian reserve in 449 can also be more easily understood. But though this interpretation can be extracted from Thucydides (i. 96), the flow of his narrative suggests that he thought his assessment of 460 talents applied only to money payers; nor would one expect the main revenue of the League to go to reserve.

The reconstruction of Athenian financial history during the Periclean period

rests very largely on the interpretation of Thucydides ii. 13. The authors now give detailed reasons, philological and historical, for preferring the text preserved by the scholiast on Aristophanes, *Plutus* 1136. The Athenian reserve had for long (ἀεί ποτε) stood at 6,000 talents but had been reduced in the thirties by 300 talents. The corruption in the text of Thucydides and fourth-century tradition is due to Ephorus, who carried out independent research with melancholy results. From Thucydides he found that Potidaea cost 2,000 talents; in estimating the cost of the Propylaea he made the same mistake as Heliodorus (2,012 talents). On his calculation 4,000 talents had been spent, 6,000 talents remained; therefore originally there had been 10,000 talents. Undoubtedly 10,000 talents is an embarrassment in the tradition, but did Ephorus work in this way? Are his constant differences from Thucydides in recording numbers due to feeble research, or to a mere desire to seem independent? Has he not here simply repeated Thucydides in a different form? If our text of Thucydides is wrong (and the reviewer still thinks that it is not less Thucydidean than the scholiast's version) it is easier to believe that it had become corrupted in some editions before Ephorus. There is, however, a further difficulty in the proposed text. The implication of ὑπαρχόντων ἀεί ποτε is that the reserve had remained steady at 6,000 talents for a long period; but the heavy spending on the Samian revolt (more than 1,400 talents in two years) rules out a stable level.

In the fuller discussion of the texts of the first two assessment periods valuable new ground is won. The opening lines of Carian cities in list 2 are explained as defaulters from the previous year, and the Carian entries at the end of list 4 are related to the presence of Cimon in the East in 450. A tentative list of payers is drawn up for the first year to support the restoration of the higher total in the summary and the case for dating the change from ships to money for a large class of islanders (and with them Iasus, Potidaea, Acanthus) to 450 is restated more fully (p. 267): 'We cannot tolerate too great a discrepancy between the names assessed and the names from whom collection was made, because defaulting by too many cities would have had a deleterious effect upon discipline.' But was discipline good after the Egyptian disaster? Erythrae and Miletus were in revolt: that they were brought back into the League does not necessarily mean that all other states were firmly controlled. In this matter the dating of cleruchies is important, and particularly the settlement in Euboea before the revolt. The authors associate this settlement with Tolmides' disastrous expedition to Coronea (p. 294): 'We believe that the klerouchs on Euboea were settled there by Tolmides as part of the strategy of this campaign, and that they were intended partly to prevent communication through Chalkis between disaffected elements on the island and exiles in Boiotia.' But the literary sources suggest that Tolmides rashly underestimated the danger, and failed to take adequate forces. To the reviewer 450 (to which year the authors tentatively assign the cleruchies in Naxos, Andros, Lemnos) is a more likely date, and disaffection in the late fifties the most likely reason.

The discussion of the lists of the second period is perhaps the subtlest argumentation of the book. List 5, previously considered to be exceptionally long, is shown by a closer analysis of the last column to have been of normal length, and a convincing case is made for identifying Miletus and a group of south-eastern cities as late payers, who are not found in list 7 but should be restored with two payments in list 8. In the study of later lists we welcome particularly

the a
dating
assess
for th
doubt
to the
comp
argum
reflect
the m
chara
haps
appar
on the
ments
this g
cariou
45 tal
Of
chron
scholi
chron
The p
the P
Not e
88), a
less co
of Ith
Coron
carrie
It is q
Samos
(heav
politic
illustr
at the
demo
in reg
Ather
loyalt
On
those
We h
analy
gener
of the
so mu
Th
exhau
plant

the analysis of the Thraceward district in the thirties, and the convincing dating of the preserved alliance with Perdiccas (*I.G.* i². 71) to c. 436. In the assessment of 422/421 (A 10) the restoration of 96 talents rather than 196 talents for the Hellespontine total is defended, but perhaps there is still room for doubt. Our evidence for the period of the Peace of Nicias is virtually confined to the islands, and the purely epigraphic indication of the layout in A 10 (as compared with A 9) suggests the higher figure. Moreover, the particular arguments set out by Meritt in *A.J.P.* lxii (1941), 1, for dating list 33 (which reflects high figures in the Hellespont) to 418/417 seem more convincing than the more general arguments for restoring it to 422/421. But, although the character of the assessment of 422/421 in districts other than the islands is perhaps not yet securely established, the explanation now suggested for the apparently wild statements of Andocides on the period of the Peace are surely on the right lines. Athens began to repay her debts to the gods by annual instalments, and extraordinary expenditure had to be met by further loans. Within this general framework the attempt to estimate definite figures must be precarious: particularly dubious is the suggestion that Athens annually received 45 talents from Aegina and 40 talents from Potidaea after their settlement.

Of the chapters that deal with more general topics, the reconstruction of the chronological background is the most challenging. The evidence of the scholiast on Aeschines and of Diodorus is convincingly discredited: the strict chronological sequence of Thucydides becomes the only decisive criterion. The periplus of Tolmides has therefore to be dated before Megabazus' visit to the Peloponnese, in 457, and the battles of Tanagra and Oenophyta in 458. Not everyone will agree that this dating is consistent with Theopompus (fr. 88), and the argument from chronological sequence in Thucydides i. 109 is less compelling than elsewhere. The case, however, against a ten years' siege of Ithome has never been more cogently developed; and the redating of Coronea in 446 is attractive. The treatment of Democracy in the allied cities carries less weight and implies a too static conception of Athenian imperialism. It is questionable whether 'between 439/8 and 412 an oligarchic revolution in Samos had been countenanced by Athens'. Is it not more likely that Athens (heavily committed in Sicily) had no option? Similarly the guarantee of political autonomy to Selymbria in 409/408 should be interpreted, not as an illustration of general Athenian policy, but in the light of the strategic situation at the time. Walker went too far when he said that no other constitution but democracy was tolerated by Athens, but the fourth-century orators were right in regarding the support of the demos in the cities as the main feature of Athenian imperialism; and the reward of their policy is well illustrated by the loyalty of the Atticizers even in the last phase of the war.

On re-reading this volume one regrets that the third part is not longer, for those who are not familiar with the preliminary studies will miss a good deal. We hear little, for instance, of the assessments of 446 and 438, and the brilliant analysis of the second period hardly receives due recognition in the more general narrative. We would also welcome a fuller treatment of the last phase of the war; but it would be unduly greedy to ask for more when we are given so much.

This review has concentrated mainly on controversial issues and has not exhausted them. One would like to discuss also the suggestion that Athens planted colonies in Ionia after the Peace of Callias, the dating of the Pontic

expedition to c. 450, the explanation of the extraordinary assessment of 443, the suggested restoration of the Colacretae in 410, and many other topics, great and small, if space allowed. Indeed, one of the main attractions of this impressive study is that it undermines complacency and stimulates fresh thinking at every point. Why had no one before suggested that the Callias of the renewed treaties with Rhegium and Leontini was the mover of the original treaties, the great peace-maker?

Source critics who attempt to distribute authorship will find no clues in internal inconsistencies. Such coherence in a triumvirate is a remarkable achievement. Like its predecessors this volume is magnificently produced. Authors and printers have combined to give us a book that is most attractive to read. Surely this is the most fertilizing contribution to the study of fifth-century Greek history since the First World War.

Balliol College, Oxford

RUSSELL MEIGGS

AN INTRODUCTION TO ROMAN HISTORY

CHESTER G. STARR, *The Emergence of Rome as Ruler of the Western World*. Pp. xi + 145. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Paper, 8s. net.

In planning a series of essays for an introductory history course the editor has made the following assumptions. Freshmen cannot be expected to come up with any knowledge of classical languages and civilization, any real familiarity with the Bible, or any acquaintance with the great historical novels. The choice therefore lies 'between some attempt to create a new brief account of the history of our tradition and the abandonment of any serious effort to communicate the essence of that tradition to all but a handful' of students. The second alternative 'must not be accepted by default', but the terms of the first are severe. Each essay in the series—and this one runs from the earliest times of Rome to the death of Marcus—is intended as background reading for a single week of a course. All names which do not 'take an integral place in the narrative' have been omitted: and in this volume Catiline, Quintilian, and the river Trebia just make the grade, whereas Clodius, the Younger Pliny, and the river Metaurus do not. The book ends with a quite admirably chosen bibliography, but perhaps the most serious cause for regret is that there can be no space to suggest which elements in the story are matters for doubt, much less why.

It is not for the reviewer to question all these premisses, but rather to say that, having assented to them, Professor Starr has performed a remarkable feat. He has covered this subject in under 40,000 words, but almost every one of them is the right word. He has dealt with interesting things in an interesting way; the balance between different periods and subjects is nicely weighted; the style is remarkably clear and easy; and above all the student will obtain an introduction to Roman literature and thought as well as to geography and the actions of men. It is a volume which would have been singled out for praise if it had been written for a reputable encyclopaedia, and no university should be so proud as to neglect it.

On one or two topics the lecturer will probably wish to expand considerably. The Roman *civitas* is one such: even the Social War appears as an event with-

out ca
Senato
Is the
the 'so
that
before
senatus
have l
into ro
to Cae
at Ro
resour
hardly
remin
ances

The
flict b
to sup
Princi
were
respec
which
the au
why t
confer
has b
expect
Sul
62 no
Queen's

WILH
consul
Univ
1950.

THE
admin
book,
gover
proc
times
norm
but w
subor
surve
rogat

out causes or particularly significant results. It may be, too, that the role of the Senate in the constitution of the later Republic is taken too much for granted. Is there not, for instance, some inconsistency between defining the *optimates* as the 'senatorial group which wished to avoid any change' (p. 64) and saying that Sulla's reforms gave the Senate 'greater power than it had ever held before or was to hold again' (p. 65)? To lessen the doubts about the limits of *senatus auctoritas* was itself a change, and more emphasis on these doubts might have both explained the Gracchan struggle more consistently and also brought into relief the issues which surrounded the commands of the period from Marius to Caesar. More might also have been said about the sources of personal wealth at Rome, and when we come to Augustus the extent not only of his own resources but also of his control over public finance was worth attention. It is hardly adequate nowadays to be told, in a passage which is dangerously reminiscent of the 'dyarchy', that the Senate 'remained in control of the finances of the Empire' (p. 97).

The chapter on the Principate is peculiarly satisfying, especially on the conflict between materialism and spiritual needs. This it might have been useful to supplement with some estimate of the loss of individual freedom which the Principate had brought. If we can risk saying that the murderers of Caesar were 'beneath contempt' (p. 75), it should be with fuller recognition of the respect which later generations paid to Brutus and Cassius and to the *libertas* which they represented. It is perhaps not irrelevant here that the definition of the *auctoritas* of Augustus is a bit anaemic (p. 98), nor is it easy to understand why the *princeps* is thought to be less like an 'emperor' because his *potestas* was conferred by law. With Caesar too, it is not so much his legal position which has been a matter of debate (p. 74) as the way in which he wished and was expected to use his power.

Sulla's *praenomen* was Lucius not Publius (p. 65), and Caesar was praetor in 62 not 63. I have noticed no other slip.

Queen's College, Oxford

G. E. F. CHILVER

PROMAGISTRACY

WILHELMINA FEEMSTER JASHEMSKI: *The Origins and History of the Proconsular and the Propraetorian Imperium to 27 B.C.* Pp. ix+174. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1950. Paper, 37s. 6d.

THE promagistracy played so essential a role in Rome's constitutional and administrative development that a special study of it is very welcome. In this book, which contains two parts (the second comprising lists of provincial governors), Mrs. Jashemski first examines the early development of grants of proconsular and propraetorian imperium to experienced ex-magistrates in times of military need when the supply of magistrates was exhausted. This was normally done by *prorogatio* (advised by the Senate and enacted by the People), but when special crises arose a consul in the field might delegate imperium to a subordinate to act *pro magistratu*. Next the commands of 218-198 B.C. are surveyed, when the disadvantage of annual magistrates was lessened by prorogation. The significant developments were the renewing of a general's

imperium for several successive years and the granting of imperium to *privati* who had served as higher magistrates several years before or even to *privati* who had never held imperium; the *privati* might be chosen by the People or Senate or receive their imperium by delegation from a magistrate. Then the methods of meeting the needs of a growing empire are examined: after 198 imperium was seldom granted to *privati* until the later years of the Republic, but besides an increase in the number of praetors, the imperium of magistrates of the previous year was increasingly prorogued as a means of providing provincial governors. The governors of the various provinces are then discussed seriatim and the conclusion is reached that all praetorian governors had proconsular imperium in Spain from 197 to the end of the Republic, also in Asia at least from Sulla's time, and many are found in other provinces, but Mrs. Jashemski does not believe that proconsular imperium was universally granted. Finally there are a few pages on *privati* with proconsular imperium in the late Republic as reflections of earlier practice and forerunners of later.

Such a study covering so wide a field naturally raises many interesting questions: only a few points can be mentioned here. Although the view that some provincial governors after Sulla were *pro praetore* is supported by Mommsen (*Staatsr.* ii. 647 ff.), Mrs. Jashemski does not seem really to have met the arguments of P. Willems (*Le Sénat* . . . , ii. 571 n. 5) that from 81 to 52 we have evidence for the title *pro consule* in Cicero, Sallust, inscriptions, and coins, but none for *pro praetore* (only the generic use of *praetor*), while *pro praetore* suddenly appears after the *lex Pompeia* of 52 which therefore presumably forbade the title *pro consule*. The command of Cn. Scipio in Spain (218-211) is adduced as probably the earliest known example of the grant of imperium to a *privatus*, and the source of his imperium (a grant in Rome or by delegation from his brother Publius?) is discussed. May not the original grant in 218 have been an emergency one by his brother, which was later confirmed by Senate or People (Spain was assigned to both brothers in the command list for 212: Livy xxv. 3. 6)? In that case it will perhaps have been *propraetorian* rather than *proconsular* as Mrs. Jashemski believes it to have been. So also when M. Iunius Silanus was sent to Spain in 210, she believes, on the doubtful strength of the remark in a speech that he was *eodem imperio* as the younger P. Scipio (Livy xxviii. 28. 14), that *Silanus propraetor adiutor . . . datus est* (Livy xxvi. 19. 10) means that Silanus who had been *propraetor* was now sent to Spain with *proconsular* imperium. But the more natural interpretation that he was sent with *propraetorian* imperium, i.e. a lesser imperium than Scipio's, would then accord with the suggested earlier precedent: a superior commander and a helper. It is well known that Livy uses both *proconsul* and *praetor* to describe the governors of Spain (who after 197 were normally praetors with *proconsular* imperium), often applying both terms to the same man. Mrs. Jashemski (p. 44) dismisses Klotz's attempt to relate this to a variation in Livy's sources, but while Klotz's conclusions may not be right, we surely have here a valuable indication of Livy's changing sources.

The lists of provincial governors in the second part of this book are very useful, but would have been more so if some recent work had not been overlooked: references should have been given, for example, to J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *C.R.* 1937, pp. 8 ff., on Scaevola (p. 51); to T. R. S. Broughton, *A.J.A.* 1948, p. 323, on Julius Caesar's father (p. 61); to Broughton, *T.A.P.A.* 1948, p. 69, on T. Aufidius (p. 62); to G. R. Elton, *J.R.S.* 1946, pp. 18 ff., on the *Rechtsfrage*

(p. 144). Reference to E. S. G. Robinson, *B.M. Cat. Greek Coins of Cyrenaica*, would have shown that Lollius (p. 81) was not governor of Cyrene c. 66 (Robinson, p. ccxvi) and that there is no evidence that Pinarius Scarpus (p. 83) was governor of Cyrene (Robinson, p. ccx), while Pupius Rufus may be dated between 30 and 27 (Robinson, p. ccxxiii). Further, the valuable evidence provided by M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, which was published in 1946, is not used, e.g. Asinius' governorship of Asia should be dated 35-34 instead of (as p. 61) c. 76 (Grant, pp. 394 f.), Lollius more accurately c. 36-34 (Grant, 56 ff.), Atius Balbus c. 38 (Grant, p. 150) instead of 59 or during the Empire (p. 121), Q. Oppius should be added as governor of Syria c. 33-30 and C. Fonteius Capito be rejected (together with the genuineness of the coin which belongs to M. Oppius Capito (Grant, 43 f., 61 f.; J. 157 f.)), while the governors of the triumviral period whom Grant has rescued from oblivion should be added (together with C. Septimius, attested as proconsul of Asia, 56-55, by cistophori). One final grumble! even in these days 37s. 6d. is a heavy price for a paper-bound book of photographed typescript.

But despite some qualifications, this is a useful introduction, with handy *Fasti*, to an important and perhaps unduly neglected subject.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

THE PREFECTS OF EGYPT

ARTHUR STEIN: *Die Präfekten von Ägypten in römischer Zeit*. (Dissertationes Bernenses, Ser. I, fasc. 1.) Pp. 248. Bern: Francke, 1950. Paper, 16 Sw. fr.

The prefects of Egypt have attracted much attention; naturally, since the office was not only important in itself but was often a stepping-stone to yet higher preferment, and a good many prefects attained distinction among Imperial administrators. In papyrology and epigraphy, however—and much of the evidence comes from papyri and inscriptions—progress is constant, so that lists like those of Cantarelli, J. G. Milne, Lesquier, and Reinmuth quickly fall out of date. A new treatment, using the latest evidence, was due, and no one better qualified to undertake it than Professor Stein can be imagined. His work is prosopographical; he does not, like Reinmuth, discuss the prefect's functions. The main part of the volume is a chronological list of prefects, giving all that is known of each, his full name if recoverable, his previous and later career, and such references to him as we have in papyri, inscriptions, and literary sources, and even citing those references to an unnamed prefect which fall within his term of office. The list ends with Pompeianus (A.D. 287-90), and is followed by a list of a few prefects whose date is unfixed. In a final section Stein surveys the field generally, discussing such questions as the social standing of the prefects, their racial origins, their prominence in the life of their time, their official *cursus*, the honorific titles applied to them, their length of tenure, and the like. After this comes a bare chronological table of names; the notes, with documentation, are at the end of the volume, and are followed by *Nachträge und Verbesserungen* and by indexes of subjects and names.

It should be unnecessary to say that Stein has done his work well. Every page gives evidence of the wide learning, mature judgement, and mastery of the

subject expected from him. He laboured under difficulties now all too familiar, but was helped by other scholars, who supplied evidence from publications inaccessible to him or from unpublished sources, and his survey is surprisingly complete and up to date. A comparison with the latest list, that of Reinmuth, shows no less than fifteen names not found there, besides fuller information about many other prefects and the removal or correction of names and details in Reinmuth's list. Already—so rapidly does knowledge grow—there is at least one addition to be made to the present work. That is Flavius Fortunius, who occurs, apparently as prefect, in the recently published P. Antin. 35 (late third century). Stein rejects (p. 28, and note 55) my suggested reading *Να]ίτων* in P. Lond. Inv. No. 2785 on the ground that Claudius could not, 'eine geraume Zeit nach dem Tode Macro's', give him the official title *ἐπαρχος Αἰγύπτου*. I never regarded my conjecture as more than a conceivable solution of a difficulty, but Stein's objection is valid only on the assumption that Claudius is reported verbatim. It is now universally agreed that the protocol form here used is a literary device, not due to copying from the *Acta*, and since the narrative, whatever its historical basis, was clearly worked up for propagandist purposes, terminological details are not trustworthy evidence. On p. 154 Stein queries Mercurius of P. Oxy. 2228 because in August of the 2nd year of Carus, to whom the editors assigned the 'year 2' of the document, Celerinus was prefect; but Mlle Préaux has shown good reason (*Chron. d'Ég.* xxiv. 345) for attributing the year to Diocletian, i.e. 285, which is free.

There are some misprints, mostly obvious, but on p. 85, l. 12, 'Αἰβεράλι (sic)' should be 'Αἰβελάρι (sic)', and on p. 223, note 504/5, last line, 'sind' should no doubt be 'nicht'. On p. 109, referring to P. Mich. 426, Stein states that the petitioner 'gibt eine Abschrift dieser Eingabe' [to the prefect]. What was actually copied was the prefect's reply, not the petition.

Aberystwyth

H. I. BELL

NILSSON ON GREEK RELIGION

MARTIN P. NILSSON: *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. I. Band: Bis zur griechischen Weltherrschaft. Pp. xxiv+823; 52 plates, 8 figs. II. Band: Die hellenistische und römische Zeit. Pp. xxii+714; 16 plates, 5 figs. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, v. 2. 1, 2). Munich: Beck 1941, 1950. Cloth, DM. 54 each.

THESE two substantial volumes do more than give a more modern substitute for the outmoded work of Gruppe. They are the best and most reliable account of the whole matter which has yet appeared in any language, and are indispensable to all serious students of it. Not only do they both state and support by full documentation the author's own views, an outline of which appeared some four years ago in his *Grekisk Religiositet* and has been rendered into several languages more widely known than Swedish, but they furnish an account of the soundest works which have appeared in the last two or three generations, from classics like Farnell's *Cults* to obscure articles lost in the pages of barely accessible periodicals. For completeness and accuracy of statement there is nothing to equal them, and one of their most outstanding features is a lively freshness, rare in works of reference and all the more astonishing when we

rem
time
S
exte
their
peri
falls
stud
(pp.
lagen
conc
sacr
of c
deit
of th
is er
Athe
Tita
and
refer
in m
The
first
cont
cult
Eleu
(670
betw
A di
Mot
as is
shor
relig
dokl
secti
inclu
of th
half
illust
inde
can
Mino
on v
scrip
prin
V
tradi
as if
tory

remember that they were written by a scholar of advanced age, in troubled times, using a language which was not his own.

Since vol. i has been in existence for some ten years and has been to some extent available at least in the United States, while of late copies have made their way into this country also, I review it but briefly. It covers the earlier period, from the beginning down to the days of Alexander the Great, and falls into six sections. The first is introductory; it sketches the history of the study since 1800 and lays stress on the importance of the Comparative Method (pp. 34-57). Part I (for the introduction is unnumbered) deals with *die Grundlagen der griechischen Religion*, first explaining what is meant by the fundamental conceptions of power and holiness, then going on to discuss magical rites, sacrifice and dedications, the words and gestures (including the use of masks) of cult, divination, belief in ghosts, aniconic objects, and the lower forms of deity, such as daimones, Keres, Nymphs, Satyrs, and so forth. Part II treats of the prehistoric period, that is of the Minoan and Mycenaean religions, one of the subjects on which the author speaks with especial authority. Part III is entitled simply *die Götter* and handles first the older deities (Zeus, Hera, Athena, Poseidon, Hades, Demeter, Artemis, Hermes, Kronos, and the Titans), then the younger ones (Ares, Aphrodite, Hephaistos, Apollo, Dionysos, and foreign gods of late or relatively late introduction); 'older' and 'younger' refer of course to the length of time the Greeks knew them, not to their places in mythological genealogies. Part IV deals with the important archaic period. The familiar antithesis between Dionysiac and Apolline worship appears in the first two sections, but in an eminently sober and well-informed shape. It is the contrast between two currents both of great importance for that age, ecstatic cult and the legalistic tendency. Next come the Mysteries, especially those of Eleusis, then Orphism, followed by Pythagoreanism, while fourteen pages (670-83) treat briefly but adequately the important theme of the relations between Religion and the State, down to and including the age of the tyrants. A discussion of two new arrivals during that period, Hekate and the Great Mother, ends this part of the work. Part V brings us to the classical period and, as is proper, the authors of that articulate age are largely drawn upon. After a short introductory treatment of what the author neatly styles 'patriotic' religion and of the religious attitude to life, we have a consideration of Empedokles, Pindar, the tragic poets, Herodotos, and Aristophanes, and the section ends with a few pages (782-93) on the new gods of that epoch, including what was to be immensely important in the next age, the idea of the heavenly bodies as divine. Four pages of concluding remarks and a half-dozen of minor addenda bring the volume to a close. Its well-chosen illustrations are grouped on fifty-two plates at the end, and it is adequately indexed. That it raises numerous problems goes without saying. Some of them can best be considered by reference to the author's other works, such as his *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*. Others result from his own setting forth of his views on very numerous matters, for he persistently thinks for himself, though he is scrupulously fair to those whose ideas differ from his. To give even a list of the principal ones would distend this notice beyond reasonable limits.

Vol. ii completes the survey down to the triumph of Christianity. The traditional and generally bad method of handling Greek and Latin material as if they had never had anything to do with each other throughout their history obliges the author either to pass more lightly than he would have otherwise

done over certain aspects of the subject or to risk saying what will no doubt be said again when Professor Kurt Latte completes his revision of Wissowa's *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. He has generally chosen the latter way, for which we may be glad; for the history of Graeco-Roman religion bristles with difficulties and to hear the views of two well-informed and highly intelligent scholars is better than listening to one only. In one section, that dealing with magic and *der niedere Glaube* (pp. 498 ff.) he has merely summarized, since there is to be a separate volume on magic and astrology; but it is such a summary as only a first-rate scholar could have written.

The volume is divided as follows. After a short introduction (pp. 1-9) we have the first main section, on the Hellenistic Age. This starts with a brief but exceedingly able sketch of Alexander the Great, the 'politische Zersplitterung' which followed his death, 'die griechische Einheit' (18-28), and the characteristics of the various countries involved. Then comes the treatment of religion in the Greek city-states, whether of Greece proper or outside it, which handles not only the actual cults and festivals but also the means (including the schools of the day) by which religious observances were kept in being. Fifty pages (125-74) deal with religion in the service of the kings, with especial reference to the deification of Hellenistic rulers and a short section on its extension to Republican Rome. Then personal religion is treated at some length (175-94), with the very proper inclusion not only of such things as belief in Tyche, mysticism, syncretism, and so on, but also of the philosophies of the time in so far as they touched on religion, as of course all did in one way or another. It is safe to say that very few will read this section without learning both facts unfamiliar to them and points of view from which they can see the significance of those facts better than before.

The somewhat larger division deals with the Roman period and falls into four sections with a concluding essay of some twenty pages. The first and shortest section orientates the reader; it explains the position of Greeks in the Roman world both historically and as regards their *geistige Haltung*. The next treats of cults, of course including emperor-worship, the third of belief, again giving a large space to philosophy, but also handling oracles, astrology and solar religion, popular beliefs, and sundry other appropriate matters. The last section devotes nearly a hundred pages to the later syncretism in all its varieties, as Hermetism, Gnosticism in the widest sense, the various foreign religions, and the vexed question (concerning which Professor Nilsson holds decided and well-thought-out views) of the so-called mystery-religions and their relations to Christianity. The *Schlusswort* is largely concerned with the author's most noteworthy contribution, perhaps, to the interpretation of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman religion; he insists on the revolution in both philosophic and popular or semi-popular thought produced by the general adoption of the geocentric astronomical system, which removed the sky from about the level of the highest mountain-tops to a distance which, for the ordinary man at least, was practically infinite. Here he draws one conclusion (p. 674 and elsewhere) with which I am inclined to quarrel. 'Es gab', he says, 'nämlich in diesem Weltbild, das die Erde frei im Raum schweben liess, keinen Platz für das Reich der Toten under der Erde.' It is, of course, true that some transferred the place of future rewards and punishments, and the habitation of souls generally, to somewhere outside the earth altogether; but I do not see that this was a necessary consequence. Dante used the same cosmography as the later ancients;

yet he had no difficulty whatever in fitting to it an underground Hell and a terrestrial Purgatory, only his Paradise being in the celestial spheres. Vergil had done, I think, something of the same kind, for I am more inclined than some to see in the sixth *Aeneid* a self-consistent picture.

There are other small points of difference, which I hope to deal with elsewhere. They are none of them really important, and mostly treat of quite trivial matters of interpretation of particular passages. Doubtless other readers will find room for difference of opinion, especially on the interpretation, not of this or that sentence of an ancient author or an inscription, but of entire groups of phenomena. But supposing all these hypothetical critics right, I doubt if one page in fifty would need radical revision.

For the most part, the printing has been well done; there are a few misprints, and in one place (p. 365, notes 2 and 3) the type has been so confused *ut diuinare oporteat, non legere*. The plates are clear and their subjects unhackneyed; the text-illustrations are mostly of somewhat unfamiliar objects. A few works of importance have appeared too late to be used; the references to Callimachus will need adjusting to Pfeiffer's new Oxford edition of the fragments, and although several articles of Campbell Bonner are quoted, his admirable work, *Studies in Magical Amulets*, should now be added, for instance, to the references on p. 501, note 10. The author has taken occasion (p. 714) to correct a few slips of his own or the printers' in vol. i.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

THE HISTORY OF POSEIDON

FRITZ SCHACHERMEYR: *Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Götterglaubens*. Pp. 219. Bonn: Francke, 1950. Paper, 13.80 Sw.fr.

THIS monograph is the thoughtful work of an historian who is especially interested in the beginnings of Greek culture, is well equipped on the archaeological side and adequately in the literature dealing with Greek religion, and seldom (some small instances are mentioned later) goes beyond his evidence. He furthermore recognizes the extent to which many of his conclusions must be tentative. This is his reconstruction of the history of the cult of, and belief in, Poseidon, from the earliest beginnings to the date which he epigrammatically gives as the conclusion, the publication of Aristotle's *Meteorologica* (p. 172). He sets it forth in eight chapters, of which the last two are of the nature of appendixes; indeed one is so referred to, p. 32. Greek infiltration into Greece began about 1900 B.C., creating the Middle Helladic culture. The newcomers, who were predominantly pastoral, brought with them, not indeed the complete figure of the god, but a complex of ideas contributory to it, a belief in horses, which they seem to have domesticated as a source of meat and milk, not yet as means of transport, as being somewhat uncanny creatures, connected with ghosts and the lower world generally, with water, and so easily forming a connexion with weather-phenomena also. They found a people whose worship included an earth-goddess called by the Aegean *Lallname* Da, and were not long in providing her with a great consort in horse-shape whom they invoked as Husband of Da, a formula which produced the name Poseidon (p. 13; the etymology is Kretschmer's). About 1570 came the Mycenaean civilization,

introducing among other new elements the use of the horse as a means of transport, attached to a war-chariot; the cavalry charger is later, about 1100. A chariot-horse is not an uncanny creature to those who breed and train him, nor has he chthonian associations of any kind, and thus Poseidon, still closely connected with horses, was less and less thought of as husband of the earth-goddess, outside regions such as Arcadia, which clung to old ways. The disturbance, of which the Dorian migration and the movement to Ionia are part, forced some of Poseidon's most ardent worshippers to become a people largely maritime, inhabiting islands and coastal districts; their god thus became a sea-god (p. 159), as he was already connected with stormy weather. For a long time he had been losing his horse-shape, for the Aegean tendency was to anthropomorphize its deities; henceforth he is connected with horses in one way or another, never one of them himself.

The above outline of necessity omits a number of interesting details as a rule well reasoned, sensible, and at the same time ingenious. To criticize them would take too long; they will repay study, for all are at least suggestive. The author has been somewhat handicapped by the inaccessibility to him of a certain amount of relevant literature, chiefly British and American, and has occasionally missed a continental work; e.g. he treats of Thessaly (p. 42 and elsewhere) without mentioning Paula Philippson (*Thessalische Mythologie*, Zürich, 1944). In a work of such modest proportions he is obliged to make statements concerning historical matters which sound dogmatic, though doubtless he is prepared to justify them in detail, or has done so elsewhere. A few instances may be given where enthusiasm for his thesis allows him to make too much of too little evidence. Thus, he is too apt to suppose a name ending in *-hippos* or *-hippe* to indicate a figure originally horse-shaped (pp. 33, 38, 39, 119, 170) and to come to a like conclusion on other grounds equally slender (p. 15 is a fair example; it is not beyond doubt, as he says, but merely probable, that in Paus. viii. 8. 2 the infant Poseidon is a foal). But such things can be discounted and still leave the bulk of his work sound and valuable.

The last two chapters treat of isolated but related problems, the complex history of Pegasos and the Trojan Horse. He explains it as due to the destruction of Hissarlik VI, which he supposes to be Priam's Troy, by an earthquake, and therefore by Poseidon; like all such theories, this one assumes large-scale recasting of the original story by some unknown teller.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

SHORT REVIEWS

Aristotelis *Physica* recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit W. D. Ross. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. Cloth, 10s. net.

SIR DAVID ROSS's *editio maior* of the *Physics*,

which appeared in 1936, was reviewed in *C.R.* I. 126-7, and since that date, though the composition of the treatise has been re-studied by A. Mansion (*Introduction à la physique aristotélécienne*, ed. 2, 1946, and G. Verbeke ('La structure logique de la preuve du premier moteur chez Aristote', *Rev. philos. de Louvain*, xlv, 1948, pp. 137-60), no great amount of work seems to have been done on

the text: I have not seen Medea Norsa, *Un frammento di fisica aristotelica in un papiro fiorentino* (Bologna, 1938), or J. M. Le Blond's edition of Book VIII (Rome, Univ. Gregoriana, 1940). What is printed here is an almost exact reproduction of the earlier text and apparatus; misprints have been removed at 230^a17, 242^b37-38 and 267^a5, and in the page-heading of 261^b13-262^a32.

There is an introduction explaining briefly the principles on which the text is constructed; these follow mainly the analysis of Diels (1882), to which the Budé edition of Carteron (1926-31) added little fresh. The main feature of both that edition and this, as compared with Bekker's, is the importance assigned to J (Vindob. 100) along with E. Many Greek manuscripts are still not fully collated—Ross's *editio maior* lists seventy-five such—but perhaps the best hope of further substantial material lies in Arabic and Latin sources.

It is a pity that the Greek index of the *editio maior* has been omitted.

D. A. REES

University College, Bangor

K. I. Βουρβέρης: *Πλάτων και Ἀθήναι*. Pp. 237. Athens, 1950. Paper.

THIS is another of Vourveris's studies in Plato's attitude towards politics and history (see C.R. liv. 113). In his introduction he argues with some eloquence that Plato preached no withdrawal from life and its realities. More truly practical than so-called practical men, he sought to provide politicians and others with the sound knowledge of principles which alone can ensure success in practical 'affairs'. To Vourveris Plato is the reformer of Athenian life—and of human life in general—in the face of the individualistic doctrines of sophists ancient and modern; right education is the most effective of reforming measures, and those who defend Plato against 'utilitarian' criticisms by pointing to his political activities and those of the Academy have missed the point: that there is nothing so crippling as *dysabla*.

The core of the book consists of forty-three pages of extracts from the Platonic corpus containing references to 'historic' events and persons. These passages are then discussed in a leisurely and expansive manner in the notes, where Vourveris produces parallel passages and further information from other literary sources, mainly the orators and the historians. His object is to bring out the Athenian patriotism of Plato and his attach-

ment to Athenian institutions, combined with his disapproval of the 'lawlessness' which infected the people and their leaders after the Persian wars, when the democracy forgot its 'godlike fear' of law, or (as Isocrates put it) ceased to practise aristocracy. In dealing with particular passages Vourveris shows himself a sympathetic interpreter of Plato: e.g. he is rightly convinced that *Gorg.* 473 c 6 ff. really does refer to the proposal for the combined trial of the generals after Arginusae, and shows persuasively that modern objections (based on the improbability of 'laughter' on this occasion and of Socrates' incompetence to take the vote) fail to do justice to Plato's manner of accommodating his historical references to the conversational context in which he uses them—Polus has laughed at Socrates immediately before this reference, and invited him to collect the opinions of those present.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

ERNEST HONIGMAN: *The Lost End of Menander's 'Epitrepontes'*. (Académie Royale de Belgique: Mémoires, XLVI. 2.) Pp. 43. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1950. Paper.

THE author believes (1) that the last scene of the *Epitrepontes* contained 140 lines more than have survived (this would reduce title, hypothesis, dramatis personae, first scene, and beginning of second scene of *Perikeiromene* to 70 lines, which seems impossible; cf. *Studies in Menander*, 5); (2) that the end followed the *Alope* fable in Hyginus: Smikrines imprisoned his daughter, exposed the baby, arbitrated between Onesimos and Syriskos about the ring; then Syriskos and Daos went and discovered the baby again (there is no reason to suppose that Menander followed the *Alope* for more than the recognition scene and there he has made considerable alterations; cf. *Studies*, 168); (3) that Syriskos is an impostor who is only interested in the money value of the trinkets (this is a question of interpretation, but the suggestion that the trinkets are to be used for paying *apophora* is unlikely as the baby wears them when seen by Pamphile (545)); (4) that a marginal gloss ('because of him the mediator was beaten to death and the discoverer was banished and the wizard was exiled'), occurring about fifteen lines after a probable quotation of the *Epitrepontes* (566 K., 7 Kō.) in Palladius' *Dialogue*, contains a reference to

the end of the *Epitrepontes* in which Smikrines was beaten up and Davos and Syriskos driven off the stage. I admit that I have no interpretation for the marginal gloss and that Theseus finally killed Kerkyon according to Hyginus; but he did not banish the shepherds. And how could all this have happened in the 140 lines which Honigman allows himself? and what relation has it to anything that we know about New Comedy?

T. B. L. WEBSTER

University College, London

Cicero: *Brutus; On the Nature of the Gods; On Divination; On Duties*. Translated by HUBERT MCNEILL POTEAT. Pp. v+661. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. Cloth, 45s. net.

THIS book is one of a series named the Chicago Editions, which is designed to make available in translation selected works of the outstanding figures in Western thought. Other contributions to the series, so far as it has progressed, represent the thought of the Renaissance, of Kant, and of Hegel. The Ciceronian volume contains an introduction of 65 pages by Richard P. McKeon, dealing with Cicero's influence, his life and times, and his conception of philosophy in its various branches; the final section estimates the importance of his work in the philosophical field. Though sometimes a little lacking in clarity, this introduction is an interesting and valuable piece of work, supported by useful references and a brief bibliography.

The translation of the four treatises has been done by Professor Poteat of Wake Forest College, who has also provided short explanatory notes at the end of the book. It is spirited and on the whole reads very well. Sometimes the translator's judgement is at fault. 'Little piddling crimes' strikes a false note in a passage in the grand manner (*Off.* iii. 83 *minuta colligimus*). On the other hand, 'physical appurtenances' is too jocular for the simple *membra* of *Div.* ii. 40. 'Foul' is too strong for *indecore* (*Off.* i. 14), as 'rather disgusting' is for *odiosiores* (*Off.* i. 130). 'The boundaries which separate good and evil' mistranslates *fines bonorum et malorum* (*Div.* ii. 2). 'Elegance' cannot represent *copiosissime* (*Off.* i. 4). Paraphrase tends to intrude unnecessarily, as in *N.D.* ii. 2 *nam contra Epicurum satis superque dictum est*, 'So far as Epicurus is concerned he has been duly

answered and indeed utterly routed', or in *Brut.* 232 *interpone igitur, inquit, si quos uidetur*, "That being the case," said Brutus, "we are ready to listen to whatever you care to say about any of these persons". But in spite of such minor faults the book fulfils its purpose well and will be of great service to those readers for whom it is primarily intended.

A. G. LEE

St. John's College, Cambridge

GOTTFRIED PRECZOV FRANKENSTEIN: *Vergil, Eklogen*. Deutsche Übertragung mit lateinischem Originaltext. Pp. 84. Basel: Schwabe, 1950. Boards, 3.25 Sw.fr.

THIS is a pretty little edition, one of a series called Sammlung Klosterberg, containing short works of various authors, some of which, if they were not written in German, have the original text opposite the German translation, as this one has. The *Eclogues* have been rendered into hexameters, which seem to me no better and no worse than hexameters in German usually are. The Latin text is a mixture of good and bad; it has the correct *rapidum cretae* at 1. 65, but Ribbeck's *haud tenet* at 3. 110 and the notoriously corrupt *cui . . . parentes* at 4. 62-63. The very short notes at the end contain some of the traditional blunders; Virgil is Tityrus in 1, Corydon in 2 (with the ancient scandal about Pollio's slave Alexander); the wonder-child of 4 is Pollio's son, and of course nothing is said of the difficulties of 6 and 10. I do not know on what authority the editor consistently spells *Polio*.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

EMANUELE CASTORINA: *Apuleio Poeta*. Pp. 42. Catania: Giannotta, 1950. Paper, L. 180.

AFTER a short introduction on the fragments of Apuleius' poems, Castorina treats in detail two points: the relationship between Apuleius' iambic poems (frs. 1 and 2 Morel) and the anonymous iambic poem in Aul. Gell. xix. 11. 4, and the influence of Catullus on Apuleius' elegiac poems (frs. 3-7 Morel).

In examining the iambic poems he points to a series of metrical similarities between Apuleius' verse and that of Gellius' *amicus adulescens* (irrational syllables, resolutions,

coincidence of ictus and accent, caesura), and to resemblances in language and style. He adds that both poets adapted erotic epigrams attributed to Plato. They cannot be one and the same person, since Apuleius cannot possibly have been described as an *adulescens* when the *Noctes Atticae* were published (according to Castorina about A.D. 180). Therefore they must have belonged to the same school or coterie, and hence Apuleius must have been in contact with Aulus Gellius, and through him with the principal poetic current of his day, that of the *poetae novelli* (Annius, Serenus, etc.).

The argument (*A* writes like *B*, *B* is a friend of *C*, therefore *A* is a friend of *C*) is invalid, and the Roman literary world of the second century A.D. was probably not nearly such a tidy place as Castorina would have us believe. But the metrical and stylistic similarities to which he draws attention are real enough, and these pages are an interesting, if minor, contribution to the history of Latin verse.

The section on Apuleius and Catullus makes too much of trivial resemblances, and leads to no more striking conclusions than that Apuleius had read Catullus and was impressed by him. This Apuleius tells us himself (*Apol.* 6. 5, 10. 3, 11. 2).

It is to be hoped that Castorina will continue his studies of the *disiecta membra* of second- and third-century Latin poetry. But he will have to be more on his guard against wishful thinking.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

EMANUELE CASTORINA: *Appunti di metrica classica*: I. *La prosodia di Commodo nella storia della metrica latina*; II. *Sulla scansione 'sdruciola' nei metri giambici ed eolici*. Pp. 18, 27. Catania: Giannotta, 1950. Paper, L. 100, 150.

In the first of these studies Castorina is concerned with the versification of Commodian, not as a forerunner of the accentual verse of the Romance languages, but for the light which it throws on the prosody of the Latin language from the earliest times. He believes that the quantitative prosody of the literary language was an importation from Greek, forced upon their native tongue by the hellenizing poets of the third and second centuries B.C. In Commodian he finds a re-emergence of the pre-Hellenistic non-quantitative prosody,

which, he argues, continued to characterize the language at its sub-literary levels.

Though not quantitative, Commodian's hexameters, says Castorina, are built, not upon the stress accent of words, but solely upon the rhythmical accent or ictus of the verse. In this respect they are akin to the saturnian metre. This seems to the reviewer both obscure and hard to square with the facts (cf. G. Devoto, *Storia della lingua di Roma*², Bologna, 1944, p. 325).

In the second study Castorina examines the problem of the final syllable of iambic and Aeolic metres in both Greek and Latin. Did it bear the rhythmical accent or not? He answers that it did. In iambic metres the rhythm is ascending, i.e. the rhythmic accent falls on the second foot of the dipody; in glyconics, alcaics, asclepiads, and the like we have at the end of the verse a choriamb followed by an iamb (in Greek) or a dactyl followed by a catalectic trochaic dipody (in Latin), and not a pair of dactyls.

It is no accident that again and again Castorina refers to the practice of Italian metre to illustrate a point. Constantly present in his mind is the problem of the imitations of classical metres in Giosuè Carducci's *Odi Barbare*. Was Carducci right to represent the alcaic, for instance, by a *verso sdruciolato*:

Te redimito di fior purpurei
april te vide su'l colle emergere,

or should he have used a *verso tronco*? This is a serious question, which only Italians can answer. But it has rather confused Castorina's approach to the not entirely parallel problem of ancient metre which is the object of his study.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

E. RAUCQ: *Bijdrage tot de Studie van de Morphologie van het Indo-Europeesch Verbum*. Pp. 198. Bruges: de Tempel. 1947. Paper.

THIS book deals primarily with questions of IE linguistics. It consists of essays on certain 'irregular' verbs in early Greek, involving discussion of such general topics as vbl. adj. -ρός, aor. -(σ)σα, aor. pass. -(σ)θην, pf. mid. -(σ)μαι, the -ννμ-, -ννω inflexions and the vowel-alternation of dissyllabic stems. Hence it merits the attention of Homeric scholars as well as of linguistic historians.

Raucq is a disciple of van Langenhove and seeks to apply in detail his theory of the growth of the IE verb, according to which a

primitive phase of uninflected nouns with pronominal and other affixes was succeeded by a true verbal inflexion akin to that found in the earliest attested languages. The statement of this theory which ends the book might with advantage have been placed at the beginning.

Raucq's treatment of the Greek evidence is stimulating and often acute; there is much of value in her analysis of *δαμάσθην*, *πελάσθην*, *ἐπλήσθην*, and her conclusions (e.g. *τανύω* from adj. **t₂nu-*) are sometimes attractive, if not convincing. She takes full account of theories opposed to her own and criticizes them effectively (e.g. Benveniste on dissyllabic stems). On the other hand, the argument is not infrequently unnecessary or irrelevant (e.g. on the difference in meaning between *τείνω*, *τανύω*, and on the absence of **τετάνυτο* as a variant on **τετάνυτο*).

The chief obstacle to belief is the theory of nominal stems itself. No real attempt is made to substantiate the nouns which are inferred from verbal forms. Despite *προσκορής* and the proper name *Αλυκορείς*, the **κορ¹οσ-* discovered in *κορέσσαι* is a strange *s*-stem, for which the different form and meaning of Lat. *Ceres* provide no support. Similarly **m₂nā-* appears to exist in forms of *μυνηίσκω* but not elsewhere. Accordingly the further conclusion that behind *φθίγης*, *φθίνω*, *φθιρός* lie three verbal nouns **g²_whiH-*, **g²_whin-*, **g²_whit-* must seem fanciful.

Misprints are numerous.

A. J. BEATTIE

University of Edinburgh

INGRID ODELSTIERNA: *Invidia, invidiosus, and invidiam facere*. Pp. 94. Uppsala: Lundeqvist, 1949. Paper.

THE writer of this treatise, by a 'semantic investigation' of the terms *invidia*, *invidiosus*, *invidiam facere*, seeks to impugn the view of E. Wistrand (*Eranos*, xlv. 355 ff.) that *invidia* is often used in a pregnant sense, to convey to an audience the meaning either of *Erregung von Entrüstung* or of *Vorwurf*. A great number of passages are collected and examined, in particular such as express *invidia* against the gods or fate, or occur in quasi-technical contexts in Quintilian; but I am sorry to confess that the result of the inquiry eludes me, and it is impossible to say whether the attack on Wistrand succeeds or not. For the treatise has been translated from Swedish into English, and—ungracious as it is to say this, it must be said—English of a kind that is very nearly unintelligible; there

is no summary either of argument or conclusions, and no means of divining what the author's views really amount to, nor is it ever made clear to me why Wistrand is so misguided as to deserve such an attack. The Loeb translations are frequently made use of, and sometimes criticized; Butler's version of Quintilian, I admit, is not impeccable; but I doubt if the author of this paper is the right person to judge it. As far as I can follow the argument at all, it looks like an examination of the subjective and objective uses of *invidia*; and no doubt it is useful to have such a number of passages collected so conveniently; but I hardly think that when the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* comes to deal with these terms there will be much advantage derived from access to this paper.

R. G. AUSTIN

University College, Cardiff

ERNST WALDSCHMIDT, LUDWIG ALSDORF, BERTOLD SPULER, HANS O. H. STANGE, OSKAR KRESSLER: *Geschichte Asiens*. Pp. viii + 767; 12 maps. Munich: Bruckmann, 1950. Cloth, DM. 22.

WHETHER or not there can be a history of Asia, in the sense in which there can be a history of Europe, we have certainly not such a history here, in spite of the title. The book consists of five independent studies, two on India and one each on Middle Asia, China, and Japan. There are no signs of an attempt to impose any unity on these studies; even cross-references from one to the other seem to be lacking.

To readers of this *Review* the sections of most interest will be the first 110 pages, dealing with the history of India to the middle of the seventh century A.D., and the first few pages of the section on Middle Asia. The former provides some useful, though very brief, indications of the results of recent archaeological work; but the apportionment of the very limited space is not faultless. To allot roughly the same number of pages to the story of Alexander's conquests and to the important century beginning about 180 B.C. is to measure by the amount of surviving information rather than by its intrinsic relevance.

Here and there a judgement may be questioned. Did Gandhara and Sind, for example, remain firmly under the sway of the Achaemenids from Darius to Alexander

(p. 42)? late as the general theory give a basis to those Roman.

On the Asia are general the absence of drawbacks need for briefest underlining mention modern

Merton

S. EITZ logy in Osloer 60. O

THIS s worked not on parison but a ating parallel The a difficu cures exorc 57); he a (p. 4) ful a proce with texts the C com 10-2 P grap will occa inte bette Wh and it h cer Gra Uni

(p. 42)? Was the earliest Buddha-statue as late as the Christian Era (p. 99)? But in general the pages on early Indian history do give a brief outline such as may be useful to those whose main interest is Greek or Roman.

On the other hand, the pages on Middle Asia are too much compressed to serve the general reader, while the specialist will find the absence of references a most serious drawback. Here, as in the rest of the book, the need for compression has precluded even the briefest of bibliographies and this gap is underlined, not filled, by the occasional mention in brackets of the bare names of modern writers.

A. R. W. HARRISON

Merton College, Oxford

S. EITREM: *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*. (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. Supplet. XII.) Pp. 60. Oslo: Brøgger, 1950. Paper.

THIS study should be warmly welcomed by workers in the New Testament field. It brings not only a great mass of material for comparison with what is given in the Gospels, but also acute observation and discriminating judgement to discern between real parallels and mere superficial similarities. The author insists that 'it is, indeed, very difficult to detect any magical method in the cures of Jesus' (p. 32), and that he was no exorcist at all and never used *ῥητισμοί* (p. 57); though in a few cases it is admitted that he availed himself of 'folkloristic methods' (p. 45). On the positive side we have a careful and illuminating examination of the procedure of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels, with many valuable comments on particular texts. These comments are not confined to the Gospels. There is, for example, a detailed commentary on *PGM.* iv. 3007-86 on pp. 10-23.

Professor Eitrem has written this monograph in English, for which many readers will be grateful. Even if the English is occasionally a little strange, it is always intelligible; and in any case it is infinitely better than this reviewer's Norwegian. While the work will have its chief interest and value for students of the New Testament, it has many things to say to those whose concern is with the contemporary culture of the Graeco-Roman world.

T. W. MANSON

University of Manchester

KARL KERÉNYI: *Labyrinth-Studien*. Pp. 72; 30 ill. on 20 plates. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1950. Paper, 8 Sw. fr.

THIS monograph, a second, enlarged edition of a work originally brought out in 1941, appeared on the seventy-fifth birthday of Jung, whose school is interested in such phenomena as are here discussed, for psychological reasons. It collects a number of instances of mazes, maze-patterns, spirals, meanders, concentric circles, and some examples of dances which trace out such a pattern. The dates range from the Palaeolithic period to the Middle Ages and even later, and the illustrations are well reproduced. So far, the work is interesting and welcome to folklorists and archaeologists.

But when an explanation of the original meaning of such patterns is attempted (why need they have any, seeing that they are a natural and common form of ornament?), the author allows himself to be led by the most far-fetched parallels and the loosest association of ideas, though it is but fair to add that he rejects sundry very absurd theories which other writers had put forth. He finds on the island of Ceram in the Moluccas a sort of maze-dance which seems to be connected with the idea of a visit to the underworld. Concluding, therefore, that all mazes originally had to do with the triad life-death-rebirth, he applies this to, among others, the classical examples. This brings him to Theseus' crane-dance, alleged to be in memory of the Cretan labyrinth. Cranes take him to birds in general, and birds to the chorus in Euripides, *Hipp.* 732 ff., in which the singers wish they could become birds and fly far away from the pitiful case of Phaidra and her stepson. Therefore this a maze-song, therefore it must have to do with death and the underworld, therefore *κενθμῶσι* in the first line must mean literal caves, not, as Wilamowitz-Moellendorf rightly took it, cloud-caverns (p. 43). Elsewhere (p. 32), *Aen.* vi. 14 ff., comes to the fore, and the blunder is made, not for the first time, of treating the series of carvings which Aeneas sees on the temple-gates as a single labyrinth-pattern.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

KARL KERÉNYI: *Pythagoras und Orpheus*. Pp. 96. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1950. Paper 8 Sw. fr.

THE title-page announces this as a third, enlarged edition, and the preface makes it

clear that the last of the three essays which the work comprises was already added in the second issue. The titles of the essays, or chapters, are respectively *Pythagorische und orphische Seele und Seelenlehre im VI. Jahrhundert*, *Die orphische Kosmogonie und der Ursprung der Orphik*, and *Die pythagorische Seelenwanderung im II. Jahrhundert vor Christus*. Not having access to the earlier editions, I cannot say how extensive the additions and alterations are, but the notes seem to refer to nothing published later than about 1940; the preface, however, cites one work of 1950.

Several interesting points are made in the course of the work, as that Pythagoreanism was heavily influenced by, even impregnated with, elements of the peculiar south Italian culture of its day (p. 16), the relations between Pythagorean psychology and biology (p. 26), and the recognition of a double view of the soul and of reincarnation, the idea that all souls are equal (*Allerseelengleichheit*, p. 12 and elsewhere), and so all alike may pass from one existence to another, and the more aristocratic and typically Pythagorean view that only the superhuman element in certain outstanding men survives and the soul of the average man is a merely biological phenomenon like the body.

But the whole is marred by strange fantasies which intrude at every turn and by stranger misinterpretations of the texts quoted. As an example I cite p. 51. We are assured that hunting was parallel to the Eleusinian Mysteries for a Greek, since in both a knowledge of the Greek language was a prerequisite. The basis of this is the Xenophontic *Cyngeticus* (2, 3), which mentions, among the things which the hunter needs, a servant to look after the nets, who must be young, active, and able to understand Greek (and so comprehend orders given in it). An odder vagary still will be found on the next page. Under the circumstances, it is hardly to be expected that the interpretations in the last section of certain remains of Ennius will be very widely accepted.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

MAN. ANDRONIKOS: *Ἀρχαῖαι Ἐπιγραφαὶ Βεροίας*. Pp. 26; 4 plates. Thessalonika: Γενικὴ Διοίκησης Μακεδονίας, Διεύθυνσις Ἱστορικῶν Μνημείων καὶ Ἀρχαιολογίας, 1950. Paper.

OF the nine inscriptions from Beroea which M. Andronikos publishes here with a scholarly commentary, seven (Nos. 2-8) are

on tomb-cippi, adorned with reliefs, of a type which the site has already yielded in abundance, and do not call for detailed mention. No. 1, on the other hand, is of quite exceptional interest in more than one respect. It is a complete record engraved on a marble stele, of an elaborate act of manumission, upwards of thirty lines in length of which the greater part is perfectly legible, and is prefaced, surprisingly, with the words *Τῷ Ἀγαθῷ Βασιλεύοντος Δημητρίου ἐβδόμου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους, μηνὸς Περιτίου*. The editor is no doubt correct in identifying this King Demetrius as the son of Antigonos Gonatas, who succeeded his father in 239 B.C. and reigned for ten years only, after having acted as regent in Macedonia on occasions during Antigonos' absence; but the fact that he used the title *βασιλεύς* in the latter capacity is an entirely new discovery; and no doubt the date of his assumption of the title will provoke extensive discussion. The editor suggests that it was assumed on the occasion of his defeat of Alexander of Epirus in 264 B.C.—at the age of about 13—adding that in any case if we reckon backwards from Demetrius' death in 229 the latest possible year would be 257/256; and pertinently contrasts the omission of the royal title from the heading of the well-known letters from Demetrius to Harpalus, found some forty years ago at Beroea (*B.S.A.* xviii. 134 ff.; revised by Cormack, *B.S.A.* xl. 14 ff.), which are dated to the 36th year of the reign of Antigonos.

The details of the act of manumission include, among other interesting features, the deposit by each of the three manumitted slaves, on behalf of himself, his wife, children, and possessions, of fifty gold staters, and of another twenty-five by a single woman. In the last few lines the stele is badly weathered, but the photograph, though rather small, enables a few more letters to be deciphered than are shown in the transcript: e.g. in ll. 30-31, where the editor reads *ΜΑ[.]ΤΥΣ[----][ΑΙΣ[.]ΥΦΝΟΣ[.]ΑΙΣ[.]Ο[.]ΑΕΙΔΟΥ*, I seem to see *μάτρυνες . . . | Αἰσχυλῖνος Ἀριστοκλείδου*. For such an important document it is essential to have as exact a copy as possible, and a squeeze might enable the last seven lines (which seem to contain names only, apart from the word *μάτρυνες*) to be read almost completely.

A. M. WOODWARD

Opuscula Archaeologica VI. (Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, XV.) Pp. 271; 97 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. Paper, Kr. 70.

THIS miscellany, which displays the wide and active interests of Swedish archaeologists, contains six papers on topics ranging from Neolithic Greece to early Christendom.

E. J. Holmberg, in 'Some Notes about the Ethnical Relations of Prehistoric Greece' (pp. 129-38), tries to identify the bearers of the Neolithic, Early Helladic, and Middle Helladic cultures. The first were agricultural Asiatics of uncertain race; the second Mediterraneans from Anatolia, interested in commerce and the sea; the third Indo-European cattle-breeders, who brought the 'megaron' (whatever Holmberg means by that word). The three groups intermixed in varying degree. Holmberg reasons plausibly, but the evidence is too scanty for convincing results.

A. Furumark's 'The Settlement at Ialysos and Aegean History c. 1550-1400 B.C.' (pp. 150-271) is important. After a preliminary examination of the Minoan (and not Mycenaean) houses at Ialysos he sets out some admirable principles for the use of archaeological and traditional evidence (pp. 181-3), and then ventures his own historical reconstruction of his period. Though in Greece the influence of Minoan culture coincides with the growth of royal power and prosperity, there was neither Cretan settlement nor suzerainty, but at first peaceful commerce. But as both Cretan and Greek power consolidated at home and expanded in the Aegean, rivalry developed and finally Knossos was destroyed (c. 1400 B.C.). Furumark, who accepts the location of the Keftiu of the Egyptians in Cilicia, considers that before the end of the fifteenth century there was much direct Egyptian influence in Crete, little Cretan in Egypt: direct relations of Greece with the East became considerable only after the fall of Knossos and then were made possible by Egyptian weakness. He argues closely, though he is more convincing when demolishing the theories of others than when constructing his own.

W. Schwabacher, 'Geldumlauf und Münzprägung in Syrien im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.' (pp. 139-49), examines some Syrian monetary hoards and particularly local imitations of Athenian silver. This is a useful assembly and discussion, for historians as well as numismatists.

M. P. Nilsson's 'Lampen und Kerzen im Kult der Antike' (pp. 96-111) summarizes the Greek (and Roman) evidence from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Christian period. The Greek Geometric epoch has left no lamps; instead torches were used for lighting. In Archaic and Classical Greece lamps were dedicated at sanctuaries, espe-

cially those of Demeter; but it was not till late Hellenistic times that the influx and influence of Oriental cults gave the lamp a part in ritual, particularly in the new cults and in domestic and peasant worship. Thence, in spite of protests, it quickly passed into Christian orthodoxy.

A. R. A. van Aken, 'The Cortile in the Roman Imperial Insula-Architecture' (pp. 112-28), derives that feature indirectly from the Greek court-peristyle. His arguments are rather pedantic and unconvincing, but he has a useful collection of plans.

T. B. Mitford in 'New Inscriptions from Roman Cyprus' (pp. 1-95) edits another fifty Cypriot stones with more pains than point. There is ultimately no more justification for publishing every fragmentary inscription than every potsherd, and certainly not with this thoroughness.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

ELEANOR and JAMES STEWART: *Vounous 1937-38*. (Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, XIV.) Pp. 394; 107 plates (3 coloured), 285 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. Paper, Kr. 125.

VOUNOUS is a site about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles east-south-east of Kyrenia in Cyprus. Here in 1937-8 the Stewarts excavated an unsensational cemetery of the Early Bronze Age. This volume is an admirable report of the excavation; the position, form, and arrangement of each grave are carefully explained, almost every object is faithfully described and illustrated, and various specialist examinations are recorded in appendixes. The one serious omission—an omission that is regrettably common in excavation reports—is that the present whereabouts of the finds are not mentioned. Many archaeologists will think the scale of this publication too generous, but the excavators cannot be blamed for making the most of their chances. The interpretation of the finds is reserved for *S.C.E.* iv. 1, but it is clear that the Vounous material partly fills a gap in our knowledge of Cyprus in the third millennium B.C. For specialists interested in that period and place this volume is indispensable. For classical students it has no direct, and very little indirect, relevance.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

MNEMOSYNE

4th Series, IV (1951), Fasc. iii/iv

W. Vollgraff, *Le Théâtre d'Argos*: contests the theory of R. Paribeni, *Dioniso* x. 314-16, that the theatre at Argos is of very late date, describes the base (two photographs) in front of the prohedria, attributing it to the fourth century, and criticizes details concerning Argos in the articles on the *cavea* by O. A. W. Dilke, *B.S.A.* xliii. 125-92, xlv. 21-62. A. W. Byvanck, *La chronologie de Praxitèle* (eight photographs): the omission of P. (except by Vitruvius, it should be added) from the list of those working on the Mausoleum, and parallels from vase-paintings and contemporary sculptors, are better data for his chronology than Pliny's 364-361 *floruit*; B. thinks he was born c. 385-380 and attained maturity c. 350, dating the Cnidian Aphrodite to 330-325, the Artemis Brauronia not before 330 (is there not evidence that it existed in 346-345?), and the Mantinea base from his workshop about 320. Anne Roes, *Une fibule étrusque du Musée de Dijon*: this gold fibula with two long catch-plates (three photographs), decorated with birds, lions' heads, and buds, is a fine and elaborate example of what Odysseus' *περόνη* may have been like; cf. Myres, *B.S.A.* xlv. 242. C. C. van Essen, *Due statue di giovani togati del Vaticano* (six photographs): holds that two statues of youths (Amelung, *Cat. scult. Vat.* 102 i, k), hitherto attributed to Trajan's principate, portray brothers living in the reign of Honorius (A.D. 395-423). C. H. E. Haspels, *Lions*: Greek and Asiatic representations of Artemis between two lions differ in that to the Greeks she triumphs over nature, to the Orientals she is Nature; two photographs and description of a shrine of Cybele in Phrygia (*J.H.S.* v. 245). H. G. Beyen, *The Workshops of the 'Fourth Style' at Pompeii and in its Neighbourhood* (eight photographs): maintains that in the 'fourth style' ten workshops may be distinguished, each with its own characteristics, and discusses two, those of the Casa dei Vetti and of the Hermaphrodites. J. H. Jongkees, *On Price Inscriptions on Greek Vases* (two photographs): discusses in particular the graffito on a r.f. kalpis at Utrecht (*A.R.V.*, p. 188, 53; *Mnem.* 3 S., x. 151-6) and the study by D. A.

Amyx, *Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Class. Arch.* i, No. 8. J. C. de Groot, *Quelques fragments de calices en terre sigillée du Musée d'Utrecht*: illustrates six sherds and describes three, Nos. 8104 (probably by P. Cornelius of Arretium), 2169, and 8069 (both A.D. 20-40). A. R. A. van Aken, *Some Aspects of Nymphaea in Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia*: a short account of the function, in origin religious but subsequently ornamental, and architecture of these, with six photographs. M. J. Vermaseren, *The Miraculous Birth of Mithras* (eight photographs): M.'s birth is always regarded as miraculous, literary and archaeological sources usually speaking of him as born from a rock or stone; even so his appearance, attributes, and attendant gods vary, and we hear also of other miraculous forms of his birth. B. A. van Groningen, *ANTIPIATPOE*: in the poem by Maistas of Delos (Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 69), l. 16, read ἀντιπάρποιος not Ἀντιπάρποιος. H. Bolkestein, *Fabula aesopica apud Plutarchum Qu. Conv. I, 614 E restituta*: in this fable of the fox and crane (wolf and stork in *Phaedr.* i. 26) we should assume a lacuna caused by haplography, καταχεα(μένη τὴν γέρονον εἰσίστασεν, οὐκ εὐωχοῦ)μένην, ἀλλὰ κτλ.; no change needed to πάγουσαν. R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, *De Tibullo I 1, 48*: supports *imbre* (excerpt. Paris.) against *igne* (AV), quoting Liv. xxiv. 46-47 and other parallels. Phillip W. Damon, *Emendations in Propertius*: conjectures on Prop. i. 6. 9, i. 18. 27. (not 17. 27), ii. 12. 6 (every word in the line changed!), ii. 29. 16, iv. 1. 81-82; the suggested deletion of iii. 12. 24-37 as a semi-learned interpolation, and of iii. 21. 27-28. H. Wagenvoort, *Ad Senecae Phaedram adnotationes*: a conjecture on Sen. *Phaedr.* 14, and comment on the translation of 41 and on the reading of 162, 305.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

LXXXXIV. 2/3: 1951

W. Schmid, *Götter und Menschen in der Theologie Epikurs*: Epicurus' relation to religion was twofold, a struggle against superstition combined with a philosophical support for *εὐσέβεια*; of these elements Lucretius took over only the first in an exaggerated form.

H. Erbse, *Zur Entstehung des polybianischen Geschichtswerkes*: Book VI is a unity, and an integral part of the whole work which was written after 146. R. Stark, *Interpolierte Daten in Ciceros Briefen*: the dates at the beginning or end of Cicero's letters are interpolations of the editor who published them. A chronological arrangement by Atticus himself may underlie the work of the editor of the collection *ad Att.*; *ad Fam.* was planned as a companion collection to *ad Att.* and may owe some of its dates to Tiro. Neither collection could have been published earlier than the reign of Tiberius. O. Walter, *Zum Westgiebel des Zeustempels von Olympia*: the central figure is Apollo with Theseus on his left and Pirithous on his right. A. J. Gossage, *The family of Prosthene at Paros*: constructs

from *I.G.* xii. 5 the genealogical table from c. 225 B.C. to c. A.D. 56. W. Kranz, *Das Gesetz des Herzens*: traces the development of the idea of an *ἀγαθὸς νόμος* from early Greek philosophy to Christianity (Romans ii. 14-15; 2 Cor. iii. 3). E. Bickel, *Das Ennius-Zitat aus Euripides bei Seneca de brev. vit.* 2. 2 und der *Topos des νεκρὸς βίος* in der Antike: reads *exigua pars est vitae ea qua vivimus*, attributes it to Ennius, and takes it to be a translation of a new Euripidean fragment μένος τόδ' ἐστὶν μικρὸν ὃ ζῶμεν ζῆσιν. H. Heusch, *Der Grabspruch des Sardanapal und die Entgegnung des Krates von Theben*: in *A.P.* vii. 325, read *ἐπιον* and scan as a spondee; the *v.l.* ἐφύβρισα is an attempt to get the exact opposite to ἐφρόνισα in Crates' reply (*A.P.* vii. 326).

NOTES AND NEWS

SIR RONALD STORRS is interested in compiling as complete as possible a collection of English translations of Horace's ode to Pyrrha (i. 5 *Quis multa gracilis*) and will be grateful to readers who will send any information about such versions to him at The Mill House, Pebmarsh, Halstead, Essex.

Mr. James R. Naiden of the University of Washington at Seattle wishes to make contact with students of neo-Latin literature (from 1400 to modern times) and would be glad if any such students would make themselves known to him and let him have information about their particular interests. He hopes to compile and circulate a list of workers in this field.

Mr. N. Teulon-Porter (High Land, Great Lane, Shaftesbury) writes: 'I am seeking information on likely sources regarding early instance in any country, or period, of the right/left rule of the road. It seems impossible that any highly organized or military people such as, for instance, the Romans or Egyptians, could have made adequate use of their road systems without a road rule. But did they have such a rule and, if so, what is the evidence? It might turn up either in literature or in the physical remains of wear and tear on roads (very doubtful) or in the masonry of twin entrances in town walls or in portrayals on pottery. Once more, here seems to be an opportunity for team work for classical scholars and archaeologists.'

The sixtieth volume of *Harvard Studies* is a *Festschrift* offered to Professor A. S. Pease on his seventieth birthday by his pupils and colleagues. The contents are as varied as one might expect: the Spoken and the Written Word in Greek (W. C. Greene), the Date of the Sixth Paeon and the Seventh Nemean (J. H. Finlay), Latin and Greek elegiacs found at Corinth (S. Dow), Catullus (J. P. Elder), the date of the *Brutus* (E. A. Robinson), the conception of dual citizenship in Greece and Rome (M. Hammond), the grammar of the ancient Alpine dialects (J. Whatmough), the relationship of Augiensis and Boernerianus of the Pauline Epistles (W. H. P. Hatch), *Mysterion* (A. D. Nock), Socrates and Christ in ancient art (G. M. A. Hanfmann), the Tours sacramentary B. N. Lat. 2296 (E. K. Rand), Walt Whitman and the classics (R. M. Gummere). Those

who know A. S. Pease as the learned editor of Cicero and Virgil will be interested to discover that he has another string to his bow as a botanical explorer and that his adventures have added hundreds of plants to the known flora of North America. They will learn with pleasure that he has just completed an edition of the *De Natura Deorum*, on the same ample scale as his *De Divinatione*, and hope to see it published soon.

From Bogotá we have received two handsomely printed volumes, published by the Instituto Caro y Cuervo, containing the Latin verses of the Colombian scholar Miguel Antonio Caro. Volume I contains his original Latin poems, in three books; the first two are mostly written in hexameters and elegiacs, with a sprinkling of lyrics; the third consists of epigrams, including one on Morley's *Gladstone*. In Volume II there are ninety-nine translations from Spanish, French, and English poetry, with the author's own annotations, which show a wide knowledge and understanding of classical and modern literature. Both volumes have been edited from the author's manuscripts by Dr. José Manuel Rivas Sacconi.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Actes du Premier Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques à Paris, 28 Août-2 Septembre 1950.* Pp. 405. Paris: Klincksieck, 1951. Paper.
- Akerström (Å.)* Arkitektonische Terrakottaplatten in Stockholm. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4^o, I.) Pp. 105; 11 plates (4 coloured), 52 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper, Kr. 60.
- Alexander (W. H.)* Maius Opus (Aeneid 7-12). (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 14, No. 5.) Pp. 22. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951. Paper, 25 c.
- Andronikos (M.)* Ὁ Πλάτων καὶ ἡ τέχνη. Οἱ Πλατωνικὲς ἀπόψεις γὰρ τὸ ὥραϊο καὶ τὶς εἰκαστικὲς τέχνες. Pp. 192. Thessalonika, 1952. Paper.
- Bardon (H.)* La littérature latine inconnue. Tome I: L'époque républicaine. Pp. 382. Paris: Klincksieck, 1952. Paper, 1600 fr.
- Beazley (J. D.)* The Development of Attic Black-Figure. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 24.) Pp. xiv+127; 49 plates. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1951. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Bonazzi (I.)* Propertius Resartus. Elegiarum libri a diuturna interpolatione redempti lectionem firmavit italice reddidit I. B. Pp. xii+369. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1951. Paper.
- Charlesworth (M. P.) and others.* The Heritage of Early Britain. Pp. 196; 24 plates. London: Bell, 1952. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Croon (J. H.)* The Herdsman of the Dead. Studies on some cults, myths and legends of the ancient Greek colonization-area. Pp. ix+112. Utrecht: H. de Vroede, 1952. Paper, 12s. 6d. net.
- Crouzet (P.), Berthet (G.)* Nouvelle Grammaire Latine. Pp. xvi+144. Paris: Marcel Didier, 1951. Boards, 450 fr.
- Crouzet (P.), Berthet (G.)* Nouvelle Méthode Latine et Exercices Illustrées. Pp. xxxiii+391; 67 ill. Paris: Marcel Didier, 1951. Boards, 800 fr.
- D'Amico (V.)* La religione e la lingua dei Sanniti nella tavola di bronzo di Agnone. Pp. 31. Campobasso: Libreria Scarano, 1952. Paper, L. 300.
- des Places (E.), Diès (A.), Gernet (L.)* Platon: Les Lois. Texte établi et traduit par E. d. P.; introduction de A. D. et L. G. (Collection Budé.) Vol. I (Livres i-ii): pp. ccxvii+70 (double). Vol. II (Livres iii-vi): pp. 154 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- De Wulf (M.)* History of Mediaeval Philosophy. Sixth edition. Translated by E. C. Messenger. Vol. I: From the beginnings to the end of the Twelfth Century. Pp. xviii+317. Edinburgh and London: Nelson, 1952. Cloth, 21s. net.

- Dodds* (E. R.) *The Greeks and the Irrational*. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 25.) Pp. xi+327. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1951. Cloth, 37s. 6d. net.
- Drabkin* (M. F. and I. E.) *Caelius Aurelianus: Gynaecia*. (Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine, No. 13.) Pp. xv+136. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Paper, \$3.
- Duckett* (E. S.) *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne: his World and his Work*. Pp. xii+337. London: Macmillan, 1952. Cloth, 30s. net.
- During* (I.) *Chion of Heraclea: a novel in letters*. Edited with introduction and commentary. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, LVII, 1951: 5.) Pp. 123. Gothenburg: Wettegren & Kerber, 1951. Paper, Kr. 15.
- Evans* (A. J.) *Scripta Minoa. The Written Documents of Minoan Crete with special reference to the Archives of Knossos. Volume II: The Archives of Knossos, Clay Tablets inscribed in Linear Script B*. Edited from notes, and supplemented by J. L. Myres. Pp. 114; 110 pp. of line-drawings, 103 coll. plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Cloth, £10. 10s. net.
- Freeman* (K.) *God, Man and State: Greek Concepts*. Pp. vii+240. London: Macdonald, 1952. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Giarratano* (G.) *M. Valeri Martialis Epigrammaton libri xiv. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum)*. Pp. xxxvi+565. Turin: Paravia, 1952. Paper, L. 2380.
- Gjurić* (M. N.) *Istorija Helenske Književnosti*. Pp. 745; ill. Belgrade: Naučna Kniga, 1951. Cloth and boards, 700 din.
- Grant* (M.) *Ancient History*. (Home Study Books.) Pp. viii+247. London: Methuen, 1952. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Hackforth* (R.) *Plato's Phaedrus*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. 172. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Hamburger* (M.) *Morals and Law. The Growth of Aristotle's Legal Theory*. Pp. xxii+191. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1952. Cloth, 24s. net.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Volume LX. Pp. 306. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 32s. 6d. net.
- Herrmann* (L.) *L'Âge d'argent doré*. (Traux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles.) Pp. viii+174. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1952. Paper, 700 fr.
- Hügi* (M.) *Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistische Dichtung*. (Noctes Romanae, 4.) Pp. vii+142. Bern: Haupt, 1952. Paper, 10 Sw. fr.
- Kelling* (L.) and *Suskin* (A.) *Index Verborum Iuvenalis*. Pp. vii+139. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1952. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Kenyon* (K. M.) *Beginning in Archaeology*. Pp. 203; 8 plates, 14 diagrams. London: Phoenix House, 1952. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Labourt* (J.) *Saint Jérôme: Lettres. Tome II. (Collection Budé)*. Pp. 212. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1952. Paper.
- Linforth* (I. M.) *Religion and Drama in 'Oedipus at Colonus'*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 14, No. 4.) Pp. 118. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951. Paper, \$1.25.
- Lob* (M.) *Cicéron: Discours. Tome XVIII (Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro Rege Deiotaro)*. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 122 (partly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1952. Paper.
- Lord* (H. G.) *A Structural Latin Course. Book I*. Pp. 272; ill. London: University of London Press, 1951. Cloth, 6s. 6d.
- McDermott* (W. C.) and *Caldwell* (W. E.) *Readings in the History of the Ancient World*. Pp. xxii+489. New York: Rinehart, 1951. Cloth, \$4.
- Maddalena* (A.) *Thucydides Historiarum liber primus. Introduzione, testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici. Fasc. 2: Capp. 24-117*. Pp. 258. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1952. Paper, L. 1300.
- Marache* (R.) *La critique littéraire de la langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au II^e siècle de notre ère*. Pp. 359. Rennes: Plihon, 1952. Paper, 1,200 fr.
- Mazzarino* (S.) *Aspetti Sociali del Quarto Secolo. Ricerche di Storia Tardo-Romana*. Pp. 440. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1951. Paper, L. 4,000.
- Mette* (H. J.) *Pytheas von Massalia. (Kleine Texte, 173)*. Pp. iv+52. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952. Paper, DM. 5.50.
- Michell* (H.) *Sparta*. Pp. ix+348. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Milne* (J. M.) *An Anthology of Classical Latin*. Pp. vii+208. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1952. Boards, 5s. 6d.
- Moore* (R. W.), *Tarn* (W. W.), *Sutherland* (C. H. V.), *Moss* (H. St. L. B.), *Taylor*

- (F. S.), *Runciman* (S.), *Dvornik* (F.) *The Root of Europe: Studies in the Diffusion of Greek Culture*. Pp. 112; 17 maps, many ills. London: Chatto and Windus, 1952. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Müller (G.) *Lexicon Athanasianum*. Lief. 6-10 (λαμβάνω-ώφελιμος). Pp. 802-1663. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1951. Paper, DM. 165.
- Murie (W. R.) *Lanx Satura*. Miscellaneous Test Papers in Latin. Pp. 28. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1952. Paper, 1s.
- Neugebauer (O.) *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*. (Acta Historica Scientiarum Naturalium et Medicinalium, Vol. X.) Pp. xvi+191; 14 plates. Copenhagen: Munksgaard (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Oldfather (W. A.) *Contributions towards a Bibliography of Epictetus*. Pp. xix+177. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. Cloth, \$4.
- Papers of the British School at Rome*. Volume XIX (n.s. Volume VI). Pp. 166; 21 plates. London: British School at Rome, 1952. Cloth.
- Paratore (E.) *Una nuova ricostruzione del 'De Poetis' di Suetonio*. Seconda edizione rifatta. Pp. 374. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1951. Paper, L. 1950.
- Parsons (E. A.) *The Alexandrian Library*. Pp. xiii+468; 2 plans. London: Cleaver-Hume Press, 1952. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Pasquali (G.) *Vecchie e nuove pagine stravaganti di un filologo*. Pp. 320. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1952. Paper.
- Perry (B. E.) *Aesopica*. A series of texts relating to Aesop or ascribed to him or closely connected with the literary tradition that bears his name, collected and critically edited with a commentary and historical essay. Volume I: Greek and Latin Texts. Pp. xxiii+765. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. Cloth, \$15.
- Rank (L. P.) *Etymologiseering en verwante Verschijnselen bij Homerus*. Pp. 158. Assen, Holland: van Gorcum & Co., 1952. Paper.
- Reesor (M. E.) *The Political Theory of the Old and Middle Stoa*. Pp. 60. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1952. Paper.
- Richter (G. M. A.) *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*. Pp. ix+86; 142 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Roberts (C. H.) and Turner (E. G.) *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Volume IV: Documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine Periods. Pp. xvii+211; 6 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1952. Cloth.
- Rostagni (A.) *Storia della Letteratura Latina*. II: L'Impero. Pp. 784; 12 plates, 442 figs. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1952. Cloth, L. 7,400.
- Rüst (A.) *Monographie der Sprache des hippokratischen Traktates Περί αἰσθησέων νόσων*. Pp. xi+115. Freiburg, Switzerland: Paulusdruckerei, 1952. Paper.
- Schmitt (A.) *Der Buchstabe H im Griechischen*. (Orbis Antiquus, Heft 6.) Pp. 32. Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1952. Paper, DM. 2.50.
- Shutter (K. H. E.) *Quibus annis comoediae Plautinae primum actae sint quaeritur*. Pp. xxxii+159. Groningen, 1952 (to be obtained from the author at Nieuwe Ebbingestraat 7a, Groningen). Paper, \$2.50.
- Schwartz (J.) *Lucien: Philopseudes et De Morte Peregrini*. (Publ. de la Fac. des Lettres de l'Univ. de Strasbourg.) Pp. 115. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.
- Sinclair (T. A.) *A History of Greek Political Thought*. Pp. viii+317. London: Routledge, 1952. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Skemp (J. B.) *Plato's Statesman*. A translation of the Politicus with introductory essays and footnotes. Pp. 244. London: Routledge, 1952. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Tarn (W. W.) and Griffith (G. T.) *Hellenistic Civilisation*. Third edition. Pp. xi+372; 4 maps. London: Arnold, 1952. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Theander (C.) *Plutarch und die Geschichte*. (K. Human. Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse, 1950-1, I.) Pp. 86. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper.
- Theiler (W.) *Marc Aurel*. Herausgegeben und übertragen. (Bibliothek der Alten Welt.) Pp. 347. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1952. Cloth.
- Thompson (E. A.) *A Roman Reformer and Inventor*. A new text of the treatise De Rebus Bellicis with a translation and introduction. Pp. xii+132; 8 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Vian (F.) *Répertoire des Gigantomachies figurées dans l'art grec et romain*. Pp. 136; 60 plates. Paris: Klincksieck, 1951. Boards, 2,000 fr.
- Yale Classical Studies*. Volume XII. Pp. 265. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1952. Cloth, 25s. net.

The *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus will be performed in Greek by members of the University at the Arts Theatre, Cambridge, on Tuesday to Saturday, 17-21 February 1953, at 2.15 and 8.0 (except Thursday evening).

Producer: Mr. George Rylands.

Composer and Director of the music: Dr. P. A. S. Hadley.

Particulars may be had from the Box Office.

PAGES 123 THROUGH 127 MISSING IN NUMBER ONLY.